A REPLIE to a Censure written against the two answers to a Iesuites seditious Pamphlet.

Wood. A.8.306

By William Charke.

1. Reg. 20. 11.

Let not him that girdeth on his armour boast as he that putteth it off.

Imprinted at London by Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie.

ANNO. DOM. 1581.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
72620
ASTOR, L OX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1897.

To the Christian Reader.

AS there haue risen vp in the Church from time to time false Prophets & teachers, which oppose them selues to the holye Prophets of God, and true teachers of his worde: so among the people where such contrarietie of doctrines hath bene deliuered, like contrarietie of hearers hath alwayes followed, not onely in iudgement, but also in their affection. For as some through the mercie of God and the sincere preaching of the Gospel, haue yeelded obedience to his worde: so many, caried away with corrupt teachers, haue for want of iudgement embraced errour in place of trueth, and carnall worshippings, in steade of the pure worship of God, which euermore consisteth in spirit and trueth. Against this so dangerous infection of false teachers, the holy Apostle Saint Iohn hath giuen vs a most wholesome counterpoyson: willing vs not to beleeue euery spirit, but to trie and examin the spirits whether they be of God. But (to speake of our times) this examination and trial may seeme very hard, seeing the teachers on both sides are thought learned, and al pretend to teach the trueth. For, it is not denyed but both sides haue had their education in schooles of learning, they haue also laboured in the liberall artes, to furnish them selues to greater matters: wherupō they al bring very good words, some shewe of reason, & seeme to haue no small force of perswasion. Howe then shall the simple people iudge, howe shal they discerne, whose iudgement and discretion should be framed by their teachers, and setled by their

2. Pet. 2. 1.

Iohn. 4. 24.

1. Iohn. 4. 1.

sownd and plaine doctrine? To this I answere, S. Iohn in that place maketh the matter more easy then it appeareth at the first shewe. For, exhorting vs not to beleeue euery spirit, he doeth drawe our consideration to the spirit and doctrine of the teachers, and not to these outwarde gifties of an eloquent stile, or a sweete sownde of pleasing wordes, which may be common to good and euil: yea wherein the euil, for want of a good cause labour to excell, and from which the godly absteine for the sufficiencie of their cause without it, & are also restrayned, lest our faith should stande in the wisedome of men, and not in the power of God. But Saint Iohn, to make this his trial of spirits yet more ful & plaine, addeth, that euery spirit which confesseth Christ Iesus to haue come in the flesh, is of God, and euery spirit which confesseth otherwise, is of Antichrist. Now therefore, let vs see howe the Apostle frameth vs to a spirit of discretion, to discerne the spirits of true and false teachers. If any man shall teach and confesse that Christ was made man, and ordeyned of God the Father a Prophet, alone to teach: a King, alone to rule: and a Priest, alone to sanctifie vs, and to reconcile vs to his Father by the obedience of faith, this confession and doctrine is of the holy spirit of God, and to be receiued, what spirit soeuer shall mightily or cunningly perswade the contrary. On the other side, if any spirit shall teach that Christ is not our only teacher by his holy Gospel, but that we must admit vnwritten beleefe and traditions, from we know not whom, to be of like authoritie with the written worde: secondly, if any spirit make not Christ alone our King and head to rule vs by his holy spirit, but teache that a mortall and sinfull man

2.Cor.2.5.

1.Iohn.4.2.

man must sit in our consciences, and for hatred or gaine (which is his practise) bynde or loose at his pleasure: lastly, if any spirit impeach the al-sufficiencie and entier vertue of Christs sacrifice offered vp once for euer, & teach that themselues must renforce it from day to day by the continu-ance of their dayly sacrifice of the Masse, offered for the quick & dead: it appeareth manifestly, that such spirits are not of God, nor their doctrine to be receiued, though it be deliuered with neuer so much perswasion of eloquent speach, or offered to vs with neuer so much expectation of worldly honour. For, to denie the most absolute vertue and effects of Christes offices, is in effect to de-nie the authoritie of his person, and to lose the benefite of all his graces, because they withdrawe a part. To this examination of spirits, without re-gard of persons, the godly Reader is to be exhor-ted. For the doctrine that giueth al glorie to God, is of God: the doctrine that attributeth some glory and ascribeth some merites to man, is of men: the religion also that is agreeable to fleth and blood, making an acceptable sounde and shewe to the outward senses, is carnall and vayne: finally, what religion so euer is not ioyned with the knowledge and exercises of the worde of God, that is no true religion, but a disguised and blinde maske full of deuilish superstition. The aduersaries take a con-trary course in making triall of their doctrine: for they woulde haue this examination of spi-rits vtterly suppressed, and vnder one title of that falsly named Catholique Church of Rome, they would bind all men to receiue for vndoub-ted true religion what corruptions so euer they teach, without any further question. Which be-ing graunted them, the examination of spirits

Heb. 7. 27. & 9. 12. 26. 28. & 10. 10.

neede not: for if Rome affirme it, the matter is sufficient and must not be denied. Also these enemies of the trueth leaue the touchstone, which tryeth al metalles, namely the doctrine, and for it they drawe the teachers into examination: supposing that if they can discredit or disgrace the men, they shall easily vndermine and ouerthrowe their doctrine. For triall of this long practise, there are so many bookes, that I neede not alleadge any, but this late Censure written as in defence of popish religion: but the authour shifting his hands very cunningly of the direct and plaine maintenance of the questions in controuersie, doth but offer at them, or giue some false fire: his leauell and batterie is against their persons and credit, that maynteining the trueth, cannot but assaile the doctrines, and put in hazarde the authoritie of the popish Church.

Therefore I am in the name of the trueth to craue it of the good Reader, to lay aside respect of men, & the regard of those gistes that may please him much, and deceiue him more: and if it be his desire, not so much to see the fight, as to beholde the issue & enioy the victory: then let him imbrace that doctrine most, that attributeth least to the broken arme, or blinde iudgement of man, that in the Church al the power and wisedome of our saluation may be ascribed to God alone, through Christ Iesus our Lorde. Amen.

W. Ch.

A Replie to a Censure written against the two answers to a Iesuites seditious Pamphlet.

IT is much to be lamented, that in the things of this life, there is not a cause so good, nor a title so iust, but when it is brought into question, the quarelling partie will readily finde out some forme of pleading against it, & in the iudgement of ỳ ignorant or partial hearer, seeme to haue a good cause & great reason on his side, when in deede, he hath neither the one nor the other. But it is much more to be lamented, that in the thinges of a better life, namely in the matters of our saluation, there is nothing so plaine in the word of God, nothing so agreeable with the vse of the primatiue Church, but it hath enemies that crie out against the light as if it were darkenesse, and against the trueth as if it were falshoode, whereby the ignorant are intertayned in their ignorance, and the obstinate hardened in their rebellion.

If the trueth be subiect to such iniuries and reproches, they that mayntaine the

trueth, must partake with it also, but alwayes with an affiance therein, that it is mightie and will preuaile. As many also as loue the trueth, & yet for want of knowlege, do as it were stagger in so great contrariete of opinions, they must not haue their faith in respect of persons, or be caried about with euery blast of doctrine, in the vncerteintie or hazard of men, who are exercised in cunning waies, and lye in waite to deceiue. For this Religion is not true, because such learned men teach it, or that false, because such wise men doe condemne it: but whatsoeuer is truely taught, and playnely proued by the holy worde of God, if thou heare it with feare and reuerence, that wil confirme thy iudgement, and establish thy heart in a good conscience of the trueth. But in handling these controuersies, because an earnest zeale of the trueth, doth prouoke the godly to a great hatred of error, and a blind loue of superstition carie away others to the slaunder of wholesome doctrine: let both sides remember, that there is one that seeth and iudgeth in these actions, whose final sentence shal stand in that great day of the Lord Iesus against al, that withhold the trueth in vnrighteousnesse.

James 2.1.
Ephe.4.14.
Rom.1.18.

nesse. This, being well considered, will ioyne christian loue with godly zeale on the one side, and somewhat stay the other, that they breake not out into a defyaunce of the trueth, and into the same open faultes, wherewith they so much and so vniustly accuse others. For, many in great want of arguments, recompense the matter with vnchristian taunts and slaunders, and not being able to ouerthrow the trueth, are yet alwayes armed with varietie and colour of wordes to charge it as a lye, and the defenders thereof as forgers of lyes, and as maynteiners of vanniable absurdities. Notwithstanding, as the trueth was not tied when Paul was in bandes: so good causes are not confuted, though the defenders thereof be neuer so scornefully reproched. 2.Tim.2.9.
This may appeare, as by many other treatises against our brethren heretofore, so by the late Censure of Ed. Campion or some other for him, that was more ready before hand, to deale somewhat with the answers made to his proud and seditious libel. For in a round stile this quareler would cary away the maintenance of an euill cause, and vnder the title & authoritie of a Censurer, ratifie his manifold and vniust accusations,

that

that so finally he may sit downe to giue open sentence against the truth. But for an answere to those accusations, and a repeale of his false sentence, I mind to follow him, as from line to line, where iust occasion is offered, that vpon examynation it may appeare, howe little force there is against the naked truth of Gods causes, in the painted wordes of mans wisedome.

This Censurer taketh in hand the open defence of ý Iesuites seditious Pamphlet, and as a man of authoritie and iudgement, to censure my answere to it: but as he hath not perfourmed the one, so hee hath greatly missed of the other. For the argumẽts alleged to proue Campions seditious enterprise in euery part of his libel, & to open the like practises in his fellow Iesuites, and other Papistes, that imploy all their labours against the Church of God, and the good estate of this kingdome, they remaine all vnanswered: the Censurer did not think it safe to giue his sentence in these matters, although he knewe well, they were the chiefe things that he should haue answered. The matters handled by the waye, as of the sect and doctrine of Iesuites, of Ed. Campions person, of disputation, of Christian

Frankens

Frankens treatise against the Iesuites, they are the matters that the Censurer hath chosen out to abide his bitter taunts, and receiue his vniust sentence. Thus this iudge, that for the skill and authoritie hee taketh vpon him, should haue censured the matter it selfe, hath dealt only with certaine accessaries, leauing the principal cause in ful force against the Iesuite.

But for proofe hereof, to come now to the Censure, Campion or the like spirit in some other petie champion, doth at his entraunce, giue an aduertisment to abuse his reader, that the Iesuites offer required not so much an answere in writing, as shorter triall in disputation. In which wordes he would seeme to make it a matter out of doubt, that he & his confederates can soone confute the religion established, and by a short way defende their Popish superstition, if they might come to the triall. But these few wordes do bewray much vanitie. For who is Campion, or who are the rest of these seedmen, that they should presume so much of themselues, as to make so short worke in anowing that popish religiõ, that hath nothing to vphold it but tyrannie, nothing to defend it but lies, nothing to re-

stone it but hypocrisie & rebellion? Where haue these disputers staied so long time? Now they are come, what can they get by renewing the battaile so often, and so lately refused and auoided by their chiefe fathers & auncient captaines? Surely, if your studied & prepared bookes, be a sure argument what you can doe in a present disputation, then I doubt not, if it were graunted, but you would therein make a short triall of your vaine challenge, and leaue a sure testimonie of your Antichristian religion.

D. Watson.
M. Peckham

This your aduertisement is ioyned with a bolde and malicious accusation, not so much against Mast. Hanmer and mee, as against the religion, and as many as professe ye same. For not hauing a watch before your lippes, you affirme it as cleare, that there can be had nothing from vs but wordes. Mast. Hanmer hath with his words brought more reason and trueth against you, then you wilbe wel able to answeare. Whether I bring nothing but wordes or no, I leaue it to them that shall measure my answere, by their owne indifferent iudgemēt, & not by ye preiudice of your vnlawfull Censure. Whereas you would seeme briefly to gather ye effect of my booke

in

in stead thereof you spread abroade your owne vncharitable and vntrue termes, censuring me and not my answere. For you accuse me of subtiltie, of falsifying, of malice, of flatterie for profite, of infinite repeticions in the termes of Pope and Popery, of invention and excesse in railing, and of bolde lyes and assertions whatsoeuer with ouer blushing. Almost euery lyne soundeth loud with some foule reproch. Therefore to answere you in them al, fi[illegible] report not ỳ chalenge subtillie for my purpose, but for a plaine discouerie of Campions practise, which is full of disloyaltie, full of Popish rebellion, and I haue done[illegible] so iustly, th[illegible] you haue thought it good to say little or nothing in his defence. Secondly what moued you to charge me as falsifying the challenge, whereas you haue not in al your censure so much as mentioned the least corruption against me: I know I followed some speciall copies, which came neither corr[illegible]ptely nor corrupted to my handes: but [illegible]ntinued their comming, and one an other with great consent. Such a charge maketh your false accusation to fall vpon your selfe as a false accuser, for a iust recomp[illegible]nce of your vniust sentence. The third accusati-

on of malice, is agaynst the brotherly loue you speake of: for the report of Campions disloyall and seditious practises, being apparauntly true, and in some of you broken out into actuall and vnnaturall rebellion, and founde readie to breake out in others, you cannot well charge mee with malice in declaring a trueth, except you can for full execution of your office looke into my heart, and there finde that I neuer felt. It is no excuse in this place to maynteine your Iesuites and Sempnaries, that their seedes of sedition, their libels, their malles, their bulles and open armes, are things done for conscience and religion: for in making such trayterous practises, the effectes of your religion and conscience, you subscribe to Saunders booke, and both make the tree very euill, because the fruite is very badde: therein also you graunt me that, which afterwards you doe denie. Touching the fourth accusation of palpable flatterie towarde higher states for gaine: if you thinke them vnworthie of such prayse, examin the thoughtes of your owne heart in that behalfe: if my duetie and conscience bounde me to say no lesse in their defence against Campions vngodly

ly suggestions, you haue iudged before the time, and one, who by the grace of God is well able to proue his speciall hatred of flatterie and gaine by such vngodly meanes. In the fifth reproch I take it as a plaine note of somewhat, that your eares tingle and are wearied with the termes of Pope and Poperie. But your infinite repetition of such superstitions cause often repetition of these fittest wordes to expresse the same: for the matter must be wearisom and worne out with you, before the proper termes thereof be worne out or buried with vs. Neither can I promise it then, for as the notorious superstition of Scribes and Pharisees, the iniquitie of Pilate, and the hardnesse of Pharao while they liued, will in no age suffer their odious names to die: so the Pope and poperie may for like rebellion receiue the like punishment, remaining for euer in all detestation. But you (for what cause I can easely gesse) haue scarsely once mentioned the Pope in all your booke, although hee be your Lorde and father, and to you neerer and deerer, then either the Prince, or the loue of your countrey.

Upon my answere you promised to en-

large

large your selfe, and in brotherly loue: but you do onely enlarge your selfe in answering a fewe articles cited against the Iesuites out of Donatus Gotuisus: in all the rest you are very short, so that my answere is not answered, but by your malicious and bold Censure here and there noted, for a worde or for a syllable, making litle for you or against me: in the rest it is charged and ouercharged, with your free taunts and vniust sentence. Your brotherly charitie, I thinke, is somewhere els bestowed.

My order in answering the pamphlet from point to point, it pleaseth you to call rouing, that you may perswade the reader, I did not leauell at the certaine marke in my answere, nor keepe a right order. Wherein you giue me occasion to speake of your order, which may fitly be called a disorder, such as also may be looked for at your hands, if you & your fellowes should come to disputation. The order you haue framed to your selfe in foure partes: first, touching the sect of Iesuites: secondly, touching Campion: thirdly, touching the challenge: and lastly, touching the dialogue added to the answere, is at your pleasure, to roue in deede at your owne markes, to bee

large

large or shorte, to touch or passe by, to answere or leaue vnanswered, as may serue best for your skill and make most for your purpose. Notwithstãding, seeing you haue framed this order, and layde downe these 4. partes to my hande, I will followe them in the same order, least I might seeme with you to make some answere where I please, and let the rest alone.

Touching the Iesuites.

The first part.

I Acknowledge my labour imployed to bring in discredit the Iesuites, whose infections are well knowne abroade, and are nowe entred to worke treason in the land. Also I graunt the speaches which in al hatred of Popish practises, so directly attempted against the Maiestie of God, and peace of this noble kingdome, I vttered in diuers places of my answere, and are nowe by you not vnfitly gathered together to be seene in one view. And because you charge me with ordinarie rayling, I might fully requite you with placing your ordinarie and extraordinarie railings in one ranke, that you may knowe your owne, and take

them home. But I haue no such purpose: and if I had, where you haue gathered my fit wordes against the wicked monkish friers or frierly monkes to fill tenne lynes, I might gather of your reproches more then can come into tenne leaues. Therefore I leaue it to the indifferent reader of your booke to iudge with what minde it is like you accused mee of rayling, that rayle so your selfe, or for want of modestie, you that haue beene so immodest and so bitter, or of absurd assertions, you that haue so many.

Concerning your charge, that I abuse the Iesuites those learned men: I answere, that godlines is true learning, and the only foundation of good life, without the which, if they had any learning, or haue any shew of good life, the greater is their sinne and hypocrisie, in imploying such gifties of God to so vile a purpose, as the defence of manifest falshoode and superstition. True it is, that the world doth knowe them, and such as they bee: But it is a small thing to be knowen or loued of the worlde: our loye is, that God doth know his and maynteine their right.

1.Tim.4.7.

2.Tim.2.19. Psal.9.4. Ier.50.34.

That I call the Iesuites a sect (which you so finde fault with all) it is not my doing

ting alone, but many haue done it before me and that learnedly, as shall appeare afterward. But your definition is first to bee noted, as comming somewhat out of place and vntrue. Touching the place I will not contend, the matter cannot be iustified, in that you define Sectaries to bein deede such as cut themselues off in opinion of religion, from the general body of the Catholike Church. For herein, as not remembring your owne arte, you confound heretiques with sectaries, making no distinction, betweene the generall and the speciall: for (howesoeuer the names are sometimes confounded) in the receiued distinction of matter, all heretiques are sectaries, but all sectaries are not heretiques: so that being diuers in nature, they cannot haue the same proper definition. Beside your faulc of confounding euen in a definition, which should serue to distinction, and to bring cleere knowledge, this also is to bee considered, that of the two, it doeth most fitly agree vnto heretiques, whose sinne & heresie standeth in cutting them selues off from the communion of the Church in opinion and doctrines of faith. Lastly, though one man once diuide him selfe, and so be guiltie

in this particular of schisme, yet by the word in common vse, wee call it not a sect, till there bee many drawen away. For if Layolas alone had troden that newe path, and vowed that speciall vowe, for his diuision and superstitious trade, hee alone should not haue bene called a sect. Wherefore your definition hath bewrayed great want of learning.

But to giue you a truer definition, A sect, according to the true etymologie of ye word, is a companie of men, that differ from the rest of their religion, eyther in matter or forme of their profession. Seing therefore the Jesuites receiue a peculiar vowe to preache as the Apostles did, euery where, to do it of free cost, to whippe and torment them selues after the example of a sect called by the name of whippers, and condemned long agoe: seeing they also as a diuided companie from all others, doe followe the rule of Layolas, it appeareth plainely, the Jesuites are a sect. As for the examples of Elias, Elizeus, Daniel, and Iohn Baptist, they are no lesse wickedly then vnlearnedly alledged, to auow their order. What are you able to bring out of the word of God, why Elias should

Chronica. chronic. fol. 215.

shoulde after more then 2000. yeeres bee brought in for a patrone of Friers: What was in Elizeus or Daniel, that may liken them to Jesuites: John Baptist that may seeme to make most, maketh nothing at all for you: for it is to be thought hee was an extraordinarie and perpetual Nazarite, & therefore his calling warranted him for his austere and extraordinarie attire and diet, which restraint or the like, is not nowe laid vpon those that teach in the Churche; hauing all their seuerall offices expressed in the worde of God. Moreouer Johns preaching in the wildernes of Judea did not withdrawe him as is imagined, into solitarie and waste mountaines, but the hillie part of Judea was in comparison of other places, called a wildernesse, being notwithstanding a countrey well inhabited, as appeareth in the booke of Josua. Thus it is cleere, that neither your definition nor examples can proue the Jesuites to bee no sect. Neuertheleſſe, as I haue answered one definition with another: so will I answere your examples farre from the matter, with examples plainelie declaring that which is in question. Saint Paul doth accuse the Corinthes of Schisme, on-

Luk.1.15.

Rom.12.6. 7,8.

Iosh.15.61.

2.Cor.1.10. & 11.18. ly because they said, I am of Paul: I am of Apollos: I am of Cephas: I am of Christ. These did not cut themselues off in opinion of religion, they did not holde a seuerall faith to themselues: but for this Schisme hee sharpely rebuked them, saying, Is Christ deuided? Therfore the Iesuites, following in ẏ like, or in more wicked steppes, receiue sentence from Saint Paule, wherein they are accused of Schisme, and condemned as a sect. For do not these votaries of Rome, do not these irregulars say, I am of Austē, I am of Frauncis, I am of Dominick, and these last men, I am of Iesus? Is Iesus then diuided? or not rather you diuided ye Iesuites, being cut off as heretiques from the mysticall body of Christ, and rent as Sectaries in your own bowels? Also the Phariseis are an other

Mat.23.2. Actes 26.5. Ioseph. antiq. Iudaic.1.lib. 13.pag.394.

example to ouerthrowe your definition, & proue ẏ Iesuits a sect. For they did not cut off themselues from the religion of the Church, yet for their seuerall order they were a notorious sect.

As I haue plainely shewed, that the Iesuites are a sect, so it is true, that they are a blasphemous sect. For what a blasphemy

is

is it to abuse the most blessed name of Iesus, for a colour to their blasphemous practises, in rooting out the pure and sincere preaching of the Gospell, that afterwarde they may bring in all the execrable superstitions & heresies of Poperie, and after many outrages, establishe againe the intolerable yoke of Antichrist? This also increaseth the offence, that they drawe to themselues alone, the most gracious and comfortable title of our fellowship and vnion in Christ Iesus, which is common to all that do beleeue, without any diuision or distinction. Wherefore, howsoeuer the discouerie went neere the heart, and made you complaine, for me to call the Iesuites a blasphemous sect, was neither lewd nor vnlearned. It is one of your nothings to make a shew of something, when you say, they call not themselues Iesuites, but the Societie of Iesus: making a distinction where none is, or if there bee any, it is made against the receiued speach euery where, and against your selfe, who, in calling them so often Iesuites, doe by the practise allowe your selfe the libertie of that speach, which you reprehend in mee. And to discouer your manifest vntrueth in

Eph. 3. 6.
Eph. 4. 4.

this small matter that can yeelde you no reward of a lye, I must tell you that Turrian an other Layolas calleth his societie by the name of Iesuites, which you denie.

Turrianus in Apologetico cap. 1. & cap. 5.

The second note against me, as contumeliously depraiuing all religious men, to deface the Iesuites, is an other slaunder: for I honor and pray for all religious men, as many as for true religion are vnited in the body of Christ, which is the Churche. But if you account only the popish Monks and Fryers religious men, and so take the tytle of religion onely to your selues, excluding al others, euen those also that are of your church, as many as are not of some regular order and habit, you haue wel layd downe my meaning: for I holde them all as wicked ministers of Antichrist, and worthy to be seuerely censured, for making the name of religious men proper to themselues, which is common to all Christians euery where. Neither am I herein to bee compared with the olde Heretiques: for they dispraised the good, and I haue spoken against the badde: they did it vntruely, and I in trueth. Therefore it is a manifest misconstruing of my wordes, as deliuered to the dispraise of thē, whem it was not in

Ephe. 1. 22.

my

my thought to dispraise: as also it was a plaine iniurie to match those auncient Monks of the primitiue Church, with the Monks and Fryers of the Popish orders, betweene whom there is so great differēce, that the name excepted, there is almost nothing wherein they should bee compared. For the Monks in the primitiue Church, whome Austen and others commend so highly, were in life and conuersation holy, painfull and learned, they liued in their houses without any superstitious vowes, as professed students of Diuinitie doe in their Colledges: they laboured with their handes, to releeue them selues and do good to others. Finally their societies were nurseries of good learning and godly life, that from thence the Churches might bee continually furnished with godly Ministers and Teachers. These being once called to the ministerie of the Church, ceased to bee Monkes and left their monasteries. But the Monkes and Friers in these ages are, as one of your fellowpapistes writeth of Cardinal Wolsey, the dregges of the people, and the reproche of mankinde. And that you may not charge mee againe with these or any other like speaches deliuered

Aug. de moribus Eccl. Catho. ca. 31 Item. de opere. Monach. ca. 14. & 15.

Aug. epist. 81 Item. ep. 76.

against

against popish Monkes & Friers, I must foretell you, that Austen doth cleere mee in writing as I haue done. For speaking of them, but when their wickednes first began to open it selfe, hee doth crie out against them, as against idle, vagrant, prowde, and vncleane Monks (accompanied since with your beggerly Friers) such as nowe pester the Cloysters, burden the earth, infect the ayre, and plant detestable superstitions in all places where they finde their kingdome of hypocrits. Bernard, a neerer witnesse of their wickednes, doeth wonderfully thunder against them, painting out their corruptions with fit words, but with more reproche then I haue vsed, or can with modestie repeate. Wherefore, howsoeuer it might haue bene a fault to speake against auncient Monkes, it is no fault to speake against the bastard Monkes of this late age. But it was your hatred without other cause to compare me with olde heretiques, and your deceite (as I noted) notwithstanding so great difference, to match the olde Monkes with your newe Friers. The writings of the Fathers are not herein against me, but their practise for me. For as I prayse the good with them, so they

Aug. de opere Monach. cap. 28.

De coena Dom. serm. 15.

they dispayse the bande with me: such as then beganne to declyne, and are nowe degenerated altogether, hauing made up the measure of iniquitie, that was wanting in their predecessours. Saint Austen also, the lowest that you will or can bryng to prooue any great good in Monkes, in his 137 Epistle, the title whereof is corruptly set downe for the purpose, as he willeth vs not to infame all Monkes for a fewe that be euil, so he willeth vs not to prayse al, for a fewe that be good. But here I must not let you pleade a false title: for if al the wisdome and authoritie of your Censureship should toyne in the matter, it cannot make this our Austen a Fryer, or so winne seuen or eyghe hundred yeeres, to aduaunce the antiquitie of your Fryers. And this also I must remember you of, that when you charge mee as making warre agaynst all the Saintes of God, for speaking against wicked Monkes, you doe therein much more accuse these Saintes and Fathers them selues, who haue done the same before me, hauing lesse occasion, because the disease in their time was not so foule, nor the infections so generall. But presently in the same cause againe, to say I haue a

Aug. epist. 137.

spirit

spirit farre differing from the Spirit of Christ, is a false and presumptuous sentence, pronounced boldly as from his seate, that doeth search the reynes and know the
Mat.12.34. heart. For Christ called the Scribes and Phariseis a generation of Vipers, and oftentimes repeated these wordes agaynst them, Woe be vnto you yee Scribes, yee
Mat.23.13. Phariseis, yee Hypocrites, they were not worne out termes with him nor slaunderous: as they are not also being vsed against their successours, bee they Monkes or Friers, or any other which haue that leauen. Your selfe also bring the name of Fryer as able to disgrace euen good men, saying in contempt, Fryer Bale and Fryer Luther. Lastly Christes example is alledged for Iesuites, but most blasphemously
Luk.9.58. and against his Maiestie. For though Christ had not where to laye his head, yet his example agreeth lesse with you in this matter, then the example of Saint Iohn
Mat.11.18. Baptist. For Iohn came neyther eating nor drinking in such sort, as men doe ordinarily: but Christ came eating and drinking, he frequented publike assemblies, and was sometimes interteined at great feasts. Howe do you then drawe the life of Christ,

to

to vpholde the wicked institution of Iesuites? When did he whippe himselfe, to warrant your practise in so doing? What worldly blessings giuen him of his Father did he at any time abandon? Howe doth his example recommende voluntarie pouertie to you Iesuites or to any? except you woulde by vertue of this example, haue all men be of your order, because all should be followers of Christ, and holde it as commaunded, or recommended for an example to be followed of all, whatsoeuer he hath done before. Thus your readie words haue soone caried you into a manifest errour. For by this your doctrine kings must abãdon their regalities, & after the example of Charles the fift, al Monarches must leaue their scepters, and betake them selues to a Fryers weede, if they wil be followers of Christ, and doe that is recommended vnto them by his example of voluntarie pouertie. And for an example to touch you nerer, the Pope he must aboue all other, put off Peters cope, and throw away his triple crowne, and become a brother of this your beggerly order.

Mag. chron. Abrah. Buchol.

In the third place you note my endeuour to bring the Iesuites into contempt

by

by their obscure cõception from one Lapolas a Spanyard, all which I graunt is true. Neuertheles I may not let you passe away with a plaine vntruth. Where doe I in al my answere cal Lapolas a Souldier? yet you say I haue done it contumeliously. For the time when Iesuites began, it was hard for any man not of your nourcerie, to set downe the very daye and yeere, when your mother brought forth those two twynnes the Theatines and Iesuites: because their obscure conception and secrete educatiõ was such, that for long time there was no difference knowen, and the differẽces which you make out of Payua dependeth vpon his credit. But for the matter, Payua saith, The Iesuits had their ful creation in the time of Paulus tertius: Kemnisius saith, they had it not before the time of Paulus quartus. I pray you what authoritie hath Payua against me, that Kemnisius hath not against you? Notwithstanding let the matter be as it is, you can gain nothing by it, for Turrian a father Iesuite saith, that the Iesuites were confirmed by Paulus tertius, and by other Popes afterward: (among whom was Paulus quartus) which proueth my report sufficiently. In handling

Torrian in apolog. in præfat.

handling this question, you graunt that which I affirmed of the Iesuites, that they were created by the Pope in Martin Luthers time. To your common obiection, that our faith began with Martin Luther, I answere, you may aswel say, the religion of the Iewes, and knowledge of the Lawe, began in Iosias time: and that Hilkia was their progenitour, because hee founde the booke of the Lawe in the house of God: who notwithstanding found no new thing, but onely the authenticall booke of Moses, whereupon the king and his people, by a diligent reading and regarde thereof, were wonne the rather to a notable reformation. For our faith is the same that hath bene euermore laid and builded vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Iesus being the chiefe corner stone, which hath also continued from age to age, although sometimes with small shewe to the world, because of many persecutions and great falling away, both in life and doctrine. Wherefore it is your euill speach, so basely to speake, and bitterly to deface the religion of Iesus Christ, that hath receiued in the eyes of all the world so great testimonie from God, to proue the worke is

2.King.22.8
2.Chro.34.15.
2.Kin.23.3.
Eph.3.20.
Apoc.12.6.

his

his owne worke, and the Gospell his owne euerlasting truth, the power whereof is stil declared from day to daye, in many wonderfull issues for the inlargement of his kingdome, and most of all, by adding to the Gospel dayly such as appertaine to his holy election.

Concerning the praise you giue to Iesuites, as reformers of vice, in my answere I haue prooued that your religion must first be reformed, and your intolerable dispensations and indulgences taken awaye. For so long as these marchandises are to be bought so commonly and for so small a price, sinne must needes abounde, and the complaint of the Lord will bee most iust against you, which was made against the couetous and vncleane priestes in Israel: They eate the sinnes of my people, and lift vp his minde euery one to their iniquitie. Hos. 4. 8. The Iesuites abandoning of all worldly pleasures & possibilities of preferment in the same, so farre forth as none of that societie hath or may take any spirituall or temporall liuings or commodities whatsoeuer, is nothing els but a superstitious worship, without commandement (as hath beene declared) inuented by them selues: being

ing moreouer against the order of the primitiue Church, and sauouring not a little of Anabaptistrie, in condemning the propertie of priuate possession of earthly blessings. But howsoeuer you sound a trumpet one before an other, to shewe the Iesuites contempt of worldly riches, and that they receiue not the preferrements, wherewith mightie Princes haue pressed them, yet, I thinke your meaning is not, but if the Pope intreat them, they wilbe sone intreated.

The humilitie of their spirit was noted in ye answere. They can be content in hypocrisie, to abase themselues, as to the dust, but it is, that afterward they may rule ouer all estates in the lande, as he did, whose stile was to the Pope, I & my king. So also I proued that the Iesuites come to intermeddle with matters of estate, & offered them no wrong therin, as shal appeare in a fitter place, whē you assay to proue the contrary.

The Censurer in the next place commeth to a discourse of three leaues touching Ignatius Layolas & Martin Luther, but altogether from the purpose: for proofe whereof, let his two arguments be examined, the one for Layolas and the Iesuites,

the other against Martin Luther and the professors of the trueth. For the Iesuites he bringeth this reason: Whosoeuer leauing his former calling, shall betake him selfe to a votaries lyfe, and therein winne soules, may be father of a Societie: Layolas did so; therefore Layolas may be father of a Societie. The first propositiō is omitted by the Censurer, but without it he can proue nothing for the Iesuites. For if any man leauing the fielde, or the like calling, maye not begin a newe order as Layolas did, howe can Layolas & his brooke iustifie their Societie? The second proposition, ꝑ Layolas, leauing his former calling, proued so good a man and wonne soules, is more then doubtfull. Thus it appeareth, that vpō two former propositions, the one false, the other doubtfull, the Censurer can make no true or cleare conclusion, that the Iesuites haue a good warrant for their newe Apostleship. Against ꝑ professors of the Gospell, there is another argument made, but with as ill arte and successe. For thus the Censurer doth reason: If Luther were a wicked man, & taught many heatly doctrines, the Protestantes may be ashamed of their progenitor: but Luther was

such

such a one: therefore the protestantes may bee ashamed of their father and religion. The first proposition is altogether false: for Luther is not our progenitour, nor the father of our faith. If he had offended, yet the trueth and professors thereof are not guiltie, or thereby iustly touched in credit. The seconde proposition is also false: for howsoeuer false witnesses come in one vpon another to sweare against him, Martin Luthers worthy praise, shall continue in all ages: the Lord hath shewed him a token of good: they that hate him shal see it and bee ashamed. Wherefore these two propositions being false, must needes bring forth a false and slanderous conclusion. Thus the Censurer appeareth much more carefull, smothely to deliuer foule reproches, then to bring a good reason for maintenance of his cause. His arguments being thus layde open, it remaineth to consider the particular speaches, whereby he setteth such colours vpon his slaunders deliuered against that holy and learned man Martin Luther and vpon his praises, for Ignatius Layolas.

Psal.85.13.

And first for the life of Ignatius Layolas, I passe it ouer, as a thing from the matter, and hauing in it nothing to bee

answered: when it commeth into the Legenda, it may haue some credit in your Church: but as it is nowe reported, I see no honour that cõmeth to you by the tale, nor harme to vs. But to you this harme maye growe, that hereafter by so slender an example, other Fryers may bee brought in as much to raygne ouer you, as you woulde raygne ouer all the Monkes and Fryers that haue bene before you. I marueil howe in this storie of Layolas you left out ẏ, which, if it had bene true, would haue made more for you then al his life beside. It is his wonderfull vision when in a traunce he did behold Iesus receiuing him and his fellowes into protection. You knowe that without a myracle your newe creatures of the Pope haue neyther lyfe nor soule.

Turrian in Apologetico. pag. 10.

For Martin Luther, what may truely bee sayde for his iust honour, that shall appeare afterward: nowe I am to answeare vnto your reproches against him. And first (howesoeuer you thinke your credit discharged by alledging them) Hosius, Cochleus, Lindanus & Xaintes haue no voyce where trueth or reason are admitted for witnesses. For in this action they are speci-

ally

ally swoyne and foyswoyne agaynst Martin Luther the ruine of their estate, beyng all agreed to lende and boyowe hes, and in one tale to conspire the death and detestation of his name. Although the sentence were true, yet wouldde you not censure him that should giue sentence against your vnholie father, according to Martin Luthers testimonie? Why then doe you thinke that we will any moye admitte Lindan and his fellowes against Martin Luther, then you will admit him against the Pope?

Therefoye in alledging Lindan, Cochleus, Hosius and Xaintes, with some others, you commit many faultes without any gayne to your cause. First you abase your selfe moye then needeth, in not thinking your owne credit as sufficient with vs to proue any thing against vs, as their credit is. Foy although these witnesses are dashed in, to make a shewe in the margent, and to deceyue the ignoyant readers that knowe neyther their names, noy their weake authoyitie: yet the Censurer, if his name were well knowen, hath against vs as much credit in his owne cause, as Lindan hath, oy Hosius, albeit hee was your great pyesident in the Councill of Trente.

Secondly in citing your owne partiall men, more carryed I thinke, with malice against Luther and these causes, then your self, their sentence can haue no more authoritie, then when a man doth stande out to beare witnesse in his owne cause, or when one thiefe giueth in euidence to acquite an other. Wee goe not about to ouerbeare you in the like causes with the bare authoritie or reportes of Martin Luther, of Iohn Caluin, of Peter Martyr, or other like men: for these are all parties, and the law alloweth no such for sufficient witnesses in their owne causes. Therefore, howe vnequall is your measure, how insufficient is your trial in bringing such testimonies against vs, as your selues would hisse at, if the lyke, or better were brought against you? Lastly, in alleadging such partiall and forsworne witnesses, you bewray an euill cause, that can not otherwise bee maintayned, then by such vnlawfull & insufficient proofes. But (seeing there can be had nothing from you and your witnesses but slaunders) let vs examine how small cause you haue, so bitterly to slaunder those that are gone before, and for so wicked purposes, to infect the iudgement of such as shal come after. En-

tring

tring into the slaunders of Martin Luther, you giue a note, that he was the beginner of the newe Gospel. Doe you not still bewray Campions spirit in charging the religion nowe established in this lande with noueltiies, and most scornefully calling the Gospel of Iesus Christ, which we preache, a newe doctrine? This is not vpon good grounde to speake against a fewe Fryers, but in a blasphemous spirite, to speake against God. But before I answere the particular slaunders layde downe against Martin Luther, I must againe adde that which you haue left out, namely howe Luther was begotte of a deuil. Surely this is as true as the rest, and Proteolus as much to be beleeued as the others. Therefore the same sparke of modestie which made your paper blush to receiue this, as a thing incredible, as offensiue to euery mans eares, and as bewraying your vnsatiable malice, mygbt also haue refused to tell the other slaunders of lyke bitternesse and no lesse vntrueth. Nowe, that Martin Luther was stroken with a thunderbolt in a medow, though you easily dare repore it from an enemie, yet you shall hardly finde a wise man that will beleeue you, the matter be- Gab. Proteol.

ing of it selfe so incredible. A thunderbolt woulde haue taken awaye lyfe, or lefte a marke behinde it, for a manifest and sure note of that which otherwise can not bee proued. I will no more beleeue Lindan in this, then in his large and wonderfull tale of a madde dogge pursued with a multitude of armed men, whose venemous teeth Lindan himself escaped, by the helpe of Saint Hubert, as they call him, for the which deliuerie he and all his house were afterwarde dedicated to the worshippe of the same Hubert. I will beleeue him no more against Martin Luther, then agaynst our owne countrey men, of whom he writeth that they of the religion in Englande (whom he calleth Caluinists) doe worship the image of ꝑ deuil. Of like credit is your other tale of ꝑ deuil, horribly crying out of Martin Luthers mouth, and as much to be beleeued from Cochleus alone, as frō him and a thousand such, making no conscience to cast out in their writings so malitious and so intollerable libels. You adde these wordes, that vpon a certaine emulation & contention betweene him and the Fryers of Dominiks order, hee left his religion, cast away his habit, broke his vowes, ma-

Defug. Idol. 144.

Idem. 100.

ried

ried a Nunne, and by litle and litle, began to preache strange newe doctrines, especially tending to all libertie and carnalitie. Howe roundlye are these things witten, and howe calme doth the floud of malicious wordes seeme to flowe, partly to disgrace that, ꝑ was lawfully done, & partly to charge him with that euill, which he neuer thought? For when the Lord did open his eyes to see (as many before haue seene) the abhominable hypocrisie and superstition of pour religion and orders, no otherwise then for hatred thereof, he left his former superstition (which you call religion:) he cast away also his superstitious order & the pharisaicall habit thereof: and thinking himselfe no longer tyed to his vnadvised and superstitious vowe, he maried in the Lorde, and all this was lawfull. That by litle and litle he began to preach strãge and newe doctrines, especially tending to all libertie and carnalitie, it shalbe founde an vntrueth deliuered against the man, and a malice agaynst the doctrine which hee taught: pour owne examples shall make the proofe.

First therfore, you charge him to teach, there is no sinne but incredulitie: neither

can

Luthde capituit. Babil. Eccles. Tom.2. Ien.pag. 278.

can a man damne himselfe, doe what mischiefe he can, except he will refuse to beleeue. I will not here measure vnto you, as you haue measured vnto me, I wil not disgrace you first, and then examine the matter: for therein you haue offered me great wrong, as shall appeare when I come to answere those places. But I may plainely pronounce, that in this place you doe in wordes and matter report an opē vntruth. For Martin Luther hath no such doctrine. First it was farre from him to thinke there was no sinne but incredulitie, and therfore he woulde neuer write so manifest an vntruth. He is vehement in condemning many other sinnes, as (beside infinite other places) it appeareth in his expounding the xv. Psalme, and more largely in his briefe exposition vpon the tenne commaundementes. This it is that you haue wonderfully peruerted: Martin Luther saith, Incredulitie, (ꝑ is, not to beleeue the promise of God) doth argue the promise of God to be a lying promise, which is a most high sinne of all other. Againe, he doth not saye as you report, a man can not damne himselfe, for that is against all knowledge, either of mans iniquitie, or of Gods iust

Operationes Luth. in Psal. 15. Tom. 3.

Item in breui expos. Decalogi. Tom. 7. 819.

iudgements:

iudgementes: but he speaketh of the baptised, which beleeue, & of the trueth of Gods promise, who cannot denie himself. Wherein he sheweth that it doth wōderfully comforte a mans soule, and incourage him to the hope of mercie, if hee shall consider the promise of God made towarde him: of which promise Martin Luther saith, it is vnpossible it should lie, being entire and not changed or changeable through any of our sinnes. And hereupō he declareth what armour we haue in respect of Gods true promise, & how to answere when sin troubleth the conscience. Afterwarde speaking of the riches of a beleeuer, he concludeth saying, Thus thou seest a Christian man, or one baptised howe rich he is, who though willing, yet cannot lose his saluatiō through his sinnes howe great soeuer, except hee wil not beleeue: for no sinnes can damne him but incredulitie alone, if faith in the promise of God, made to the baptised, returne and stand, all other vices are swallowed vp in a moment, by the same faith, yea by the trueth of God that can not denie him selfe, if thou confesse him and cleaue faithfully to him that promiseth. In which wordes Martin Luther speaketh

De Capti. Babil. eccles. Vsa. 1.

2. Tim. 2. 13. Tit. 3. 8.

not

not of a faith separated from good workes, or accompanyed with sinne onely; but of that faith which bringeth forth as fruites and effectes those good workes which God hath prepared, that wee shoulde walke in them. This is the true and comfortable doctrine of Martin Luther, to proue it impossible, that the elect shoulde bee deceiued or fall awaye, or that the multitude of their sinnes, shoulde barre the grace and promyse of God. Wherefore seeing Martin Luther sayth, Incredulitie is the greatest sinne, and you say, he affirmeth there is no sinne but incredulitie: Seeing hee sayeth in respect of Gods promyse all the sinnes of the righteous man without want of faith can not condemne him: and you vtter it most corruptly, as if he saide, a man can not damne himselfe do what sinne he can: Lastly, seeing Martin Luther speaketh of the elect, and you vtter it as spoken of all, euen of the wicked, the godly reader may beholde your malicious and false reportes that haue in this first place, hainously charged Martin Luther with a doctrine, which was neuer in his hearte to embrace, much lesse in his purpose to publish by writing. Yet I confesse this his sound doctrine

Ephe.2.10. Gal.5.6.

of

of our certaine saluation, is against your Trent doubtfulnes, in so vndoubted a couenaunt, as is that which the Lorde hath confirmed to his children with an othe that cãnever be repealed.

Concil. Triden. de iusti. Can. 13.

2 In the second place out of his sermon touching Moses, misreporting the title as I thinke, you cite these wordes. The ten commandements apperteine nothing vnto vs. Wherin you would bring the reader vnto an opinion, that Martin Luther altogether reiecteth the moyall lawe of God, setting men free from the obedience or regard thereof. If you could proue but this one article against him, without your further reproches, it were sufficiẽt to bring his honour to the dust. But I dare auowe in your name, that you are not so ignorant, as not to know his cleare doctrine to the contrarie, both in other bookes, and in that from whence you drewe out these wordes, leauing the sense behinde. I graunt he hath such words, but neuer laid downe so nakedly, or to proue such an error, as your report importeth. For speaking against such as vrged the policie of the Iewes, and layde the yoke of Moses Law vpon christians, he resisted this doctrine, expounding the differences

Luth. Concione quo modo et quo fructu lib. Mosis a Christ. legendi sint. tom. 3. Ien.

Gal.3.11.12. & 4.24. rences betweene the two couenantes of God: one in the ministerie of Moses, which is the perfect obedience af all the Law: the other in the mercie of Christ apprehending righteousnes by faith. The first as he teacheth, apperteyned for a time to the Jewes alone, ꝑ seconde afterwarde both to Jewes Rom.2.16. and Gentiles, as many as beleeue. Wherupon he proueth at large, that the law doth not apperteyne vnto vs, as it did to the Jewes: the yoke and ceremonies thereof, lie not vpon vs to obserue in such sort as it pressed them. All which doctrine, is as Rom.6.14. largely taught by the Apostle, prooving that wee are not vnder the Lawe, but vnder grace: Gal.3.19. and in another place, that the lawe was giuen because of transgression, til the seede came which was promised: againe in the same place, the Lawe was our schoolemaster to Christ, that we might be Ibidem.24. made righteous by faith, but after faith is come, we are no more vnder the schoolemaster. Which places do cleerely shewe, ꝑ Moses Lawe apperteineth not to vs, as to the Jewes: wee are not vnder it as they were, the yoke and condemnation thereof doth not binde vs as it did them: which is al that Martin Luther teacheth: distinguishing

ing our time from their time, and our estate vnder Christ and the Gospell, from their condition vnder Moses and the Law, according to that excellent distinction of S. Iohn: The lawe was giuen by Moses but grace & trueth came by Iesus Christ. We are vnder Christ and vnder grace, not vnder Moses and the yoke of his lawe: we haue the trueth and not the multitude of shadowes and ceremonies, that were vnder the Mosaical administration. Now, that Martin Luther did acknowledge the doctrine of the lawe profitable to vs, though the yoke and former mynisterie thereof be taken away, it appeareth by his exposition of the Lawe, and by his wordes out of the same sermon which you alleadge, where he saith, We receiue and acknowledge Moses for a teacher in deede, whence we learne much wholesome doctrine but as a lawegiuer or gouernour we do not acknowledge him. Also afterwarde hauing repeated the commaundementes, he demaundeth, saying, Is it not necessarie for vs to keepe these? are they not vniuersally commaunded to all men? I answere, saieth he, they are to be kept of all and apperteyne vnto all. Thus it is

Iohn 1.17.

Luth. in exposit. Decalogi tom. 3.

Luth. eadem concione.

cleere

cleere, although M. Luther acknowledgeth not the yoke, the curse, the Mosaicall gouernment, which were proper to the Iewes, and appertayne not vnto vs: yet in other respectes hee is plentifull in shewing the profite and vse thereof to Christians: for it is, as Dauid saith, a lanterne to our steppes, and a light vnto our path. Therefore you shall doe well to regard your steps, least your selfe seeme to neglect the lawe of loue and trueth as appertepning nothing to you, if you thus misreport & misconster any mans wholesome doctrine.

Psal. 119. 105.

3 Your thirde report of Luthers doctrine is, that it is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are foure Gospels. Touching this third place, I find the effect of your report els where, for these first and chiefe wordes: but the latter wordes concerning Iohns Gospell, that it is the onely faire, true, and principall gospell, I cannot finde, I thinke there was neuer any such preface written in latin by Luther, as you cite for your defence. You haue in many places vsed the auouch at large, which Lawiers thinke vnlearned in their cases, and oftentimes you cite bookes not to bee gotten,

In præfa. ad nou. testam.

Luth. enar. rat. in epist. Petri. tom. 3. witteb.

gotten, as this preface, and that booke de missa angulari, and laide downe one title for an other, with such like practises, to occupie your answerer more in finding out your places, then in making answere to foure of your bookes. But I thought only to note your practise herein: nowe let vs returne vnto the matter. Martin Luther doeth neyther him selfe exclude Matthewe, Marke, or Luke, from beyng the Gospel, neyther mouldе he haue anye man barre the other writings of the Apostles from that title, because all that was written by the foure Euangelists, and what so euer the holy Apostles wrote beside in the newe Testament, all that is one Gospel in substance, though there be foure whose seuerall bookes vsually are called foure seuerall Gospels. Therefore to speake of the foure Euangelists first, in respect that the holy Ghost vsed them as foure pennes, and foure witnesses, all writing the Gospel and story of the doctrine and deedes of Christ: we may say there are foure Gospels. But in respect they wrote in an heauenly harmony, in one Spirite, in one trueth, for one and the same worke of faith, the Gospell being one and the same

Act. 1. 1.

in all foure, there are not foure, but one Gospell. As for the rest of the Apostles, what they haue left to the treasure of the Church in the booke of God, that also is the same Gospel, and the Apostle doth call his doctrine and Epistles by that name: which is to be obserued for auoyding a corrupt iudgement, in thinking lesse authoritie or maiestie of Gospell in the Epistles, then is in the bookes of the foure Euangelists: for in respect that they were sent from the Apostle, to the Churches absent, they are called Epistles: as other mens letters are called in like case: but in respect of the doctrine therein deliuered, it is the same which saint Luke and saint John did write, and beare no lesse honour, howe so euer some custome of speach otherwise doeth hinder a right iudgement in this behalfe.

Rom.2.16. &.16.25. 1.Thess.1.5.

To this thirde article onely hath the Censurer giuen his Censure, wherein hee hath not so much reprooched Luther, as bewrayed some want of exercise or iudgement in the Scriptures. His wordes are that Luther saide this, because the other three Gospels spake too much of good workes: whereby the Censurers opinion is cleere, that Saint John speaketh lesse

of

of good woorkes then the rest. I graunt that Iohn hath a speciall course in describing the diuinitie of Christ, and the loue of God towarde vs: but that hee is inferiour to the rest in teaching good woorkes, I can not graunt it, neither can the Censurer prouе it. But for proofe of that I say, one or two places of many may be sufficiente. If loue be the fulfilling of the Lawe, and the newe commaundement, not to loue one another, as euery man loueth him self, but more perfectly and more abounuantly, as Christ hath loued vs: if to bring forth much fruite, as branches in the vine, be the fountaine of euery good work: if to follow the shepheard Christ and to obey his voyce, be better then al sacrifices: then Iohn doth most mightily teach the true doctrine of good woorkes.

Iohn 13. 34.

Iohn 15. 2.

Iohn 10. 4.

4 The fourth report is, if any woman cannot, or will not proue by order of law, the insufficiēcie of her husband: let her request at his handes a diuorce, or els by his consent let her lye priuily with his brother or with some other man. Accuse not vs for your fault: but couer it or take the shame therof to your selues. True it is, Luther gaue this euill counsell, but as

Luth. serm. de matrim. Tom. 5. witteb. pag. 120. a.

he answereth for himselfe, hee did it when he was yet among you, teaching shriuing priestes, what to answere when such doubtes are moued by them that come to shrifte. Also hee sayth it was his aduice, when hee was holden with the feare of Antichrist: but now saith hee (speaking of the time after his conuersion) my mind is to giue other counsel. What holy writings can bee free from your foule reproches, if you will thus racke a peece of sentence against the manifest purpose of the writer? But it appeareth that you wrote these things by heare sayes, or made none account what examination your booke abide, your name being vnknowen.

Ibid. pag. 119. b.

Ibid. pag. 120. a.

5 In the fift place you lay downe these wordes against Martin Luther. If the wife will not, let the maide come. These wordes thus barely set downe, import a wicked opinion and doctrine tending to carnalitie, as if Martin Luther allowed of fornication, sending the vnruly husband to his maide seruant vpon any refusall of the wife. But they were of set purpose and malice rent from the other wordes and sense of the writer, to make a shewe of that opinion which was neuer in M. Luther

Luth. Serm. de matrimonio, Tom. 5. witteb.

ther reclaymed to the knowledge of the Gospel. For in this place he speaketh of a third cause of diuorce, when the woman shall obstinately refuse her husbandes companie: & bringeth in the man often chiding his wife with these words, wherefore if they preuayle not, he maketh his complaynt to the Magistrates, and doeth nothing but after a solemne diuorcing, as was that of Vasthi, and after a solemne espousing, as that of Esther: which example he setteth downe in the same place, and alludeth vnto it by some Dutch phrase, not sounding so well in other tongues as the matter will beare being rightly taken. If this opinion of diuorce seeme grosse, as it may, yet your Poperic, whence this proceeded, hath somewhat more grosse euen in this poynt. For it permitteth a man if hee will, to put away his wife, because she was a bondwoman, and he knewe it not before the marriage. The like is alledged out of Sutten, to prooue that a man may bee diuorced from his wife for couetousnesse, or sutch other sinnes, because they are spiritual fornication.

Esther 1.

Pet. Lomb. Tit. 4. dist. 36 tomb. codé libro, dist. 39

8 The sixt report of Luthers doctrine is, that Matrimonie is much more excellet

Luth. lib. de voc. Puang.

Gen.2.22. then virginitie. Mariage was ordained in Paradise, mariage increaseth the number
Heb.13.4. of saintes, it is honorable among all men: so much cannot be sayd for virginitie. The comparison I will not stand upon, they are both good, yet neither good for all: but mariage for him that can not contayne: and
1.Cor.7.2.27. virginitie in some respectes, as the Apostle noteth: which Luther in many places doth likewise acknowledge. The first point
Serm.de matrim.pag.126.b.In7.2 cap.prior.ad Corinth. pag.16. might seeme to you a beame in his, which tows woulde not haue bene deemed a mote in your eyes.

Luth. lib.de Vot.Monast. Your seuenth reporte is, that Christ and Saint Paul dyd not counsaile, but dissuade virginitie vnto Christians. It is not hard, I suppose, to winne out from you the justification of this doctrine: for you cannot thinke that Christ perswadeth all men to abstayne from mariage. Seeing his wordes are not generally spoken to all whatsoeuer, but to al such as can contayne:
Matt.19.12. He that can receiue, let him receiue. Which wordes for auoyding of sinne, implie thus much also, not as counsaile onely, but as a commaundement: he that can not contayne
1.Cor.7.9. let him marie, to auoyd fornication, as S. Paul inforceth. So that all Christians,

 which

which haue not that rare gift of continencie for auoyding of sinne, are counsailed to marrie: all that haue the gift, for them it is more profitable many wayes to abstayne. This Luther teacheth out of Christ and Paules doctrine, not to ouerthrowe virginitie, but to condemne your vngodly hatred of chastitie, without due examination, whether you haue the continent gift. Serm. de matrim. 126.

8 The eyght report is lyke the former, making it as necessarie for euery man to haue a wife, as it is to eat, drinke or sleepe. It is as necessarie for him that hath not the gift to marry for auoiding of sinne, as it is to eate and drinke for auoyding of famine, that is not so dangerous as sinne. When you meme so deepe as these matters, you were desirous rather to bryng nothing in deede, then nothing in shewe. Lib. de vot. coniu. ex in assert. art. 16.

9 Your last report is, that M. Luther should make all Christias as holy & as iust, as y mother of God, & as y Apostles were. These wordes are true in respect of Christ, in whome all the faythfull haue holynesse and honour equally, notwithstanding there may bee inequallitie in their giftes, and in the measure of their glorie. I will not stande vpon the comparisons of these di- Luth. serm. de Trinit.

Psal.84.11. stinctions seruing litle to edification: He
that is but a doore keeper in the house of
Apoc.21.2. God, the new Ierusalem, hath infinite glo-
rie. Yet because you make the virgin Ma-
rie and Apostles to beare more rule with
Christ in heauen, then they did while they
liued vpon earth: Martin Luther teacheth
Act.10.34. vs, there is no such respect of persons with
God: but in Christ Iesus whether in hea-
uen or on earth, there is neyther Iewe nor
Gal.3.28. Grecian, bond nor free, neither male nor fe-
Col.3.11. male, but we are all one in him. They haue
2.Pet.1.1. all the same glorious inheritance, as they
had al like pretious faith. For the diuersity
of measures I haue not bene a companion of
your bastarde Denis in his iourney to hea-
uen, to describe the degrees and dignities
Mat.20.23. there, or to determine that, which Christ re-
ferred to the determination of his Father,
who shall sit at his right hande in his king-
dome, & who at his left. Thus I haue an-
swered these places of M. Luther faithful-
ly & without any of your bitternesse in scof-
fing and bastring at a vantage of nothing,
as if you had thereby gayned the whole
cause. By my answere it may appeare,
these nyne places contayne no straunge
newe doctrine, as you haue reported with-

out

out that regarde of trueth or modestie which is pretended. But what is that you dare not write, to bryng the mans diuine and cleare doctrine into contempt, with as many as will be caried away with your smooth stile and bold accusations? For, as not contented with these vntrueths, you woulde make ye reader beleeue, ye you leaue other infinite beastly doctrines of his, inuented by much cōference with the deuil, as you auouch the matter out of Lindan. But touching the broken and insufficient credit of this Lindan & other your authors I haue noted somewhat before: and such as your witnesses are, such are their testimonies also: the witnesses not lawfull, and the testimonies not true. For Lindan, that hath here filled one page of your Censure, as a false witnesse, writeth that the deuill hath bene seene talke bodily with Martin Luther, by men of very great credit. The men are not named, nor the matter probable: therefore we may beholde a conspiracie to leaue the matter, and disgrace the man: one beginneth a slaunder, and the rest come in, one after another to iustifie the same vpon that foremans credit. If we had no better testimonies, this practise woulde bee

Lindan de fugien. idolis cap. 8.

bee as plentifull and strong for vs as for you: but we haue not so learned Christ, neither doe we stande in neede of euill euidences to auow a good cause. But in this matter, because you bring in Luthers wordes against himself, to proue some part of your reporte, let vs see your misconstruing, brought for a defence of your misreport. It is well knowen, M. Luther felt many tentations, and endured great conflictes with the enemie, which are very strange to the most of your religion. Christ hath rendered the reason of your quiet, and godly mens disquiet in this affliction of conscience: when a strong armed man, saith he, keepeth his Palace, the things are in peace which he possesseth. As long as Satã had Luther in possession, kept in the chaynes of ignorance and superstition, dee felt not the malice of his spirituall enemie: Satan had no cause to disquiet a superstitious man, whome hee had for the time in quiet holde: but when the Lord opened his eyes to see, and framed his heart to withstande the kingdome of Satan and Antichrist, the the enemie assailed him greuously, as himselfe complaineth in many places. All which conflictes were not as you dreame, in an

Eph. 4. 20.

Luk. 11. 18.

outward

outward or bodily conference with the world: but in those inward battailes, in those spirituall combates betweene the flesh and the spirite, betweene the tentations of Satan and the desires of the New man: such as the Apostle noteth in diuers places. Though the Iesuites be not by experience acquainted with this greeuous whippe of God, wherewith he scourgeth many of his deare children, yet by reading they might haue knowen what it meaneth. For Christ suffered such tentations, and Paul acknowledgeth a pricke in y flesh, giuen him, and the angel of Satan to buffet him. But to make all this playne, that Luther was not otherwise tempted, then in the exercise of his conscience, and with these inward conflictes of the flesh, fighting agaynst the Spirit, and againe with the agonies of the spirit, resisting the assaultes of the Deuill, which (as was noted) other saintes of God haue suffered, and Christ himselfe, it appeareth by his owne words in the fouer places cited for your purpose. I see (sayth well, sayth Luther in Dauid and in the other Prophetes, how greatly they did wrastle and groane in these battayles and the like, agaynst Satan and his horrible assaultes,

Gal.5.17. Ephe.6.12.

Matth.4.3.

2.Cor.12.7.

Luth. de missa priuata et Vnct. sacerd. Tom. 7. Witteb. pag. 239. &c.

Christ

Christ also him selfe (thouth without sinne) what teares, what anguish, and what agonies indured he for vs against Satan? He doeth infinitely presse our heartes; and ceaseth not, but when hee is beaten backe with the worde of God. Wherefore you doe not onely in this slaunder intolerablie reproche Martin Luther, but you speake euill also of the wayes of GOD, whereby hee worketh in the hearetes of his children, true mortification and strength in Iesus Christ, to ouercome such sharpe and dangerous tentations. The treatise of Luther de missa angulari so oft alledged by your fellowes, I coulde neuer see, therefore it is as the allegation of his testimonie that is dead, or can not bee found to giue in euidence face to face: when he is reuiued & commeth forth to beare witnesse, he shall bee answered. Touching Luthers death slaine (as you think) by ye deuil, going drunken to bedde vnernight, you shoulde neuer haue discredited your owne discretion in reporting so foule a lie from so insufficient witnesses, the contrary being knowen, to many yet alive, & written by men more indifferent, & of better intelligence touching the story. As Lindan hath thus slaunde-

Luc. 22. 31.

Iob. Sleid. Comment. lib. 16.

red

red his death, so you slaunder his life, saying that almost thirtie yeeres he liued in al sensualitie and pride. If there had beene any materiall argument, or some false witnesse at hande, you would not haue come in your selfe all alone to be sworne vpon this deposition. That which you lay against him of dissention, hath somewhat to be graunted. For (if you call it dissention) he did altogether dissent from Papists, being open enemies of the Gospell: but for Oecolampadius, Bucer, and others, although in some poynts they disagreed, yet there was among them a singular care of vnitie in the Gospell. Whereupon, beside the entercourse of many louing and godly letters, they set downe articles of agreement, subscribing their names for a testimonie of their loue, as appeareth especially by an acte of concord agreed vpon at Marburge: and after that by another concluded at Wittenberge. We might farre most iustly requite you with this accusation of dissention among your selues, although you are banded together in a consent against the kingdome of Christ: but this is from the question, although you often fall into it.

Actiones de concordia Marpurgæ. 3. oct. Anno. 1529. Item Wittenberge. Anno 1536.

After these prayses of Ig. Lapolas,

and

and manyfolde slaunders against Martin Luther deliuered in the best manner, without any proofes against the one, or for the other, you leaue the matter for the indifferent reader to iudge. The iudgement is soone giuen, if your proofes were as manifest as your boldnes in vttering vntrueths.

A most patient mynde can not brooke a libell so seasoned to itching eares. Our corrupt nature is more patient and glad to read a whole booke, written with a pleasing grace of scoffes and taunts against another, then a leafe written sicly to correct and teach our selues: and we are both more skilful to write and more apt to receiue reproches, then any doctrine of importance: for the one is home bredde, the other must come downe from aboue. But notwithstanding all your cunning, if the reader stande vpon proofes, and not vpon bare speach: if he stand vpon witnesses of credit, and not vpon these false subborned witnesses, the matter will fall out against Layolas as a superstitious obscure fellow: and for Martin Luther as a man that hath written more, then Layolas (I thinke) euer read: that hath taught more, then Layolas could conceiue: that hath suffered for a

Iam. 3. 15.

good

good conscience, more then euer did Layolas vnder his voluntarie whippe: who fynally was the meane by the mercie of God to plant more, then all the broode of Layolas shall euer be able to hinder in ẏ grouth, or by their infinite and shamelesse lyes any waies to impeach in worthy estimation.

The Censurer not satisfied with al these vngodly iniuries against Martin Luther, now breaketh out into such wordes of stomacke against M. Caluin, saying that the like life or worse is written of him by a French man that liued with him sometimes of the same religion. You take the best way throughout all your Censures to bring the men still into suspicion and hatred, because you can effect no more against the cause. But for Mast. Caluin, beside so many as yet remaine aliue witnesses of his godly and blamelesse life, his writings shal testifie to all ages hereafter, that the Lorde raised him vp, as a singuler Minister of the Gospel, and indued him with such a spirit of wisedome and learning, as may worthely kindle greater loue to him in godly mẽs hearres, then is malice against him in your vncharitable spirites. The Lorde is most wise, and testifieth his loue in the dispensa-

tion

tion of his singular graces: So great gifts of true zeale, of an vnderstanding heart, of a minde not ouercome with any seruice of the Church, with any labour for the brethren, are reall arguments, that, as the Lorde did sanctifie and defende him against all the malice of his enemies while he liued, euen against the fierie dartes of Satan: so now, though the man be layde vp in peace, yet the Lorde will preserue his name in honour vpon the earth: and they that would bring shame vpon him, it shall light vpon them selues, as a iust recompence from him, who euermore preserueth his saintes as the apple of his eye. Therefore it was no euill chaunce, but the Lords good will, that hitherto the translation of your libel against him should be suppressed.

Deut. 33. 10. Zach. 2. 8.

I maruaile how you passed by the storie written against M. Bucer, seruing you so wel for this purpose. Seeing you heue left it out, I wil briefly note it for a proofe of my exceptions taken to Lindan, as to a shamelesse lyer against the holy men of God. M. Bucer liued to the great good, and died amongst vs with the great and publique sorow of manie. His life and death is written by M. Carre, a man against whom you

can

can take no iust exception, who hath these wordes of him: He liued so as no man better: he died so as no man more blessedly: his sickenes was such that no man did see him sorowe: he died so that no man did perceiue his departure. Many are yet aliue that will witnesse as much as M. Carre hath written. Yet your great author Lindan is not ashamed to make M. Bucers death as horrible, and as monstrous as may bee suspected, comparing it with foule wordes and in all horrour to the most shamefull death of Arrius that Archheretique: I appeale to them among you (if there be any) which regard the truth, that they would reforme them, or giue sentence against such manifold and hainous slanders, odious to God and men, who are witnesses of their malice and vnrecty, that thus in their vnbridled affections haue added vnkindnes to chiefe.

Epist. Nichol. Carr. ad Io. Checum de obitu Buceri.

Lind. de sugien. idolis, cap. 11. pag. 91.

Deut. 29. 19.

In the fourth place I am charged to fulfill the Iesuites wordes cited out of the Censure of Coln: but how false this charge is, it shall hereafter more easily appeare. For if the Censurer him selfe, reposing most intollerable slanders, in contempt of M. Luther, hath not thought his credit

 discharged,

discharged, if hee report the matter as it is in his owne corrupt authors, Hosius, Lyndanus and Cochleus: howe much more haue I discharged my credit, in reporting the Censure of Colen faithfully out of a learned treatise of Don. Gotuisus, alleadged for my warrant: for I pretended not to cite their wordes out of the Censure of Colen, which I could neuer get, but expressly protested to take them, out of a treatise concerning this matter, the author whereof is quoted in the most bookes: and hauing performed this touching the sense faithfully, as may appeare by conference, I can in no respect bee charged with falsifying, howsoeuer to vndermine the truth, and discredit the maintainers thereof, you cauill about wordes left out or put in, without any change of matter. But you that challenge mee for additions, why doe you twise adde the word (Verie) to helpe your cauill, and once misconster mee, as if I would haue men know I minded to bring no syllable of myne owne? This is to call mee to a straight account of that I neuer vndertooke: and in vice pointes to take vantage of syllables, when you can take no iust vantage of wordes and sentences.

Wherefore

Wherefore to take away from you the only matter of shew in al your Censure, I confesse that I doe not deliuer the scriptures in the number of woordes and syllables, but in the ful weight of true sense and matter. Which practise, beside example of the fathers, we haue also in Christ and his Apostles. This you knowe, and yet of an euill purpose you dissemble the matter, prouing your selfe thereby to be a manifest cauiller, as was declared. Therfore I need not bee ashamed to offer my booke in this point to be censured by you, or examined by any. Neither am I priuie, as the Lorde knoweth, to any purposed falshoode be it neiter so litle, or to any euill practise in allegation of scripture, or other writings of any man. But you, either with shame or without shame, in the next sentence vtter in one breath foure untruthes. For first we haue not all printes to our selues, as you say, for then you could not so soone haue printed your censure & some other bookes: Secondly, our searchers are not so watchfull, that nothing can passe our handes, as your owne booke wil testifie against it self in this sentence: Thirdly, we can neither saye nor print what we will, but that only,

Mat. 4. 4. Gal. 3. 10. &c.

which after view and diligent examination hath, or should haue, priuiledge from her Maiesties lawefull authoritie. Lastly, you would make your reader beleeue, that you were beyond Sea, when you wrote and sent this shamelesse censure, which now is euidently knowen to be otherwise. Wherein I note the iudgement of God against you, that in our sentence where you haue falsely charged vs with vttering slaunderous vntrueths, you haue your selfe written these foure manifest lies. Moreouer, that it may appeare, who it is in deede that vttereth many manifest and inexcusable vntrueths, let it bee also considered, what you thinke of the preaching of Gods word in England, and what manifest vntrueths you vtter afterward, saying, that what I & my fellowes dare auouche, in our sermons, speaches and discourses (as you call them) we are sure, shall neuer come to the examination. Daily experience giueth sentence against you in this matter, and one of your late bookes, repeating certaine articles corruptly gathered out of Sermons, made in the countrey the last Summer. Here also you discouer Campions veine, in charging the Magistrates and learned

Bishops,

Bishops, as if they were carelesse, what doctrine is deliuered vnto the people. For my selfe, I admitte not your comparison betweene my writings & my preachings, as if I durst bee holder to falle in a Sermon, then in writing a booke, that may be disclosed. For, to answere also for my godly fellow ministers, we preache as before God and Angels: and dare as little in their presence presume to preache otherwyse then his worde giueth commission, as wee dare to write otherwise before men then the trueth can allowe. 1. Tim. 3. 15. & 6. 3.

Nowe followe the XIII articles of doctrine, wherewith the enemies of the trueth are charged, especially the Iesuites as the chiefe mainteiners thereof. And because you offer your selues to bee holden guiltie of al other doctrines whereof you are accused, if these articles bee proued against you: I woulde haue you standé to your owne condition: for my part, I accept your conclusion to bee iudged as I haue dealt with the Iesuites, in wel reporting or misreporting their doctrine out of mine authour.

The first article out of the Iesuites blasphemous doctrine, hath, as Gocuisus 1

Cens. Col. 54.89.

reporteth, and as you will not deny: it is not sinne whatsoeuer is against the word of God. The report lieth vpon my authour (as I haue sayde) yet you charge me with the wordes, as guylefully reported, as peeced and culled out for my purpose. But notwithstanding this charge, you presently acquite both mine authour and me, graunting the wordes to bee most true in their sense. If they be in their sense most true, why do you take any exception to my report, who onely lay them downe to peelde what sense you can make? Therefore before I wade any further, let me aske you a question or two. If any one of these xiiii poyntes of doctrine bee false, why dyd you not playnely denie it? If they be all true, why dyd you not playnely graunt them? why dyd you wrangle, making them true and false, fast and loose, perfect and imperfect at your pleasure? Through all your discourse, doe you not playnely graunt them: and yet to helpe your owne credit, and to purchase agaynst mee some note of bad dealing, would you not seeme in some sort to denie them? But as this pretended denial of those articles was an iniurie to me, so the open maynteinaunce of them a-

gayne

gayne was your trustie seruice toward the Iesuites, and the couenant of your right hande. It was also safe dealing to graunt them, because if you woulde deny any one of them in the playne sense, wherein it is auouched, yet the auouchment shoulde bee proued agaynst you by your owne recordes. Thus the good reader may see your dealing, that so accuse mee, that so double and redouble the lie vpon mee, for laying downe nothing, but knowne groundes of popish doctrine, which you coulde not denie, and whereof the Iesuites haue lately vndertaken the principall defence.

To returne to the matter, the Censure of Colen was made (as you saye) agaynst Ponhemius Catechisme: & among other poyntes to condemne him for saying that concupiscense, remayning after baptisme, is a damnable mortal sinne, albeit no consent of heart be giuen vnto the same. To auoyde your doubtful speach of damnable mortall sinne, and the distinction of mortal and veniall sinne, you must understande, Ponhemius spake not of the sinne vnto death, for the wich wee are taught, that a man must not pray. Otherwise understan- 1.Ioh.5.16.

Rom.6.23. ding mortall sinne according to the worde of God, and not as you doe, without Christ all sinnes are mortall: and (that one sinne against the holy Ghost excepted) in Christ all sinnes venialein which true sense, Bonhemius dyd truely affirme, that concupiscence is a damnable sinne. But you deny his definition, to establish your owne: Let us therefore examine the grosse faultes, which these Iesuites of Colen commit in one definition, notwithstanding they were so many, and (as you say) so learned men. They teach, by your report first, that sinne is an action. Whatsoever they say, or Thomas of Aquine in this question, you shall finde that iniustice is a sinne, and yet no action: and that it is a sinne as well not to doe the thing commaunded, as to commit the thing which is forbidden, which leaving of good offices vndone, you knowe is called the sinne of omission: and yet no action, as you woulde haue it. For Andradius distinction in this matter, is beside are and to no purpose. Also in this place, howe childishlie doe you cast in an exception of euill men and such like, that they are agaynst the lawe of God, confounding and huddling in deede:

Matt.12.31. 1.Ioh.5.16. Mich.7.19. Col.2.15. 1.Iohn 1.9.

Palma of the sacr. exp. lib. 3. pag. 185.

The

The question is altogether of the corruption, transgression and sinne which man cõmitteth, and you runne to beasts and to the sinne of deuils: where in it is good to note, that as you speake not to the question, so your speach is not true. For euill men as they are the creatures of GOD, are not against the Lawe, but the euill in men: not the deuils, but the corruption and euill in them: not euill lawes, as they commande, but ꝑ euil in lawes, as it is either commanded or executed. You must put a difference betweene the creatures and ordinances of God, which are all good as they were created and ordeined, and the same as they are nowe by themselues, corrupted and made abominable. To that you say these things are not properly sinnes, for that they are no actions, I answere, If nothing be sin, but that which is an action, what Censure will you giue upon Gods iudgement against Hely, for not vsing discipline toward his sonnes? What sentence will you pronounce for those watchmen, that sound not the trumpet, when they see the enemie comming? Here is no euill action done, but a good action left vndone, & ꝑ is a sin, and hath receiued the punishmẽt of sinne.

Gen. 1. 31.

1. Sam. 2. 22.

Ezech. 33. 8.

It

It followeth in the Iesuites definition: Sinne is an humane or reasonable action. I would not say, sinne is an humane or reasonable, but a beastly or vnreasonable action of a man indued with reason. Yet in the Censurers iudgement, if a madde man or a foole kil a man, it is properly no sinne: but these effects of sinne, these great infirmities of folly and madnes shall excuse murder, adulteric and other like enormities. Lastly you say, in the definitiō of sinne, it must be added, that it is a voluntarie action, & done wittingly. Al these additions are additions in deede, and lay open notable corruptions in your doctrine. For whatsoeuer is not of faith is sinne, be it against thy will, or w̄ thy will, bee it an action or no action, be it reasonable (as you speake) or against reason. If this part of their definitiō were true, thē original sin should be no sin, because you cannot make it an action done willingly or wittingly. Moreouer, touching manslaughter done vnwillingly or vnwittingly, and to one that is not hated, it may be answered, that hee that hath so killed a man must flee to the citie of refuge: if he be found from the bounds and liberties thereof, then the auenger of bloud may kill him.

Rom. 14. 23.

Deut. 4. 42.

him. Also he cannot depart from the Citie of refuge, till the death of the high Priest, whose death seemeth herein in some sort to prefigure the forgiuenes of his sinne, in the death of Christ, the great high Priest. Lastly Howlets booke acknowledgeth a sin of ignorance against Christ the wisedome of the Father: and hee maketh willing sinne and wittingly committed, to come neere the sinne against the holy Ghost. Thus betweene your doctrine and his, it will fall out that some sinnes are no sinnes: and againe, that all sinnes are done wittingly, and therefore are in some sort against the holy Ghost, & not easely remitted. Which doctrine condemneth all veniall sinne, and leaueth no place for indulgences and Pardons: for al sinne is wittingly and willingly done, sayth the Censure: and all such sinnes are against the conscience, and therfore damnable saith Howlets author. This is the harmonie and consent of your doctrine, to mitigate the sorowes of a weake conscience wth many discordes placed in an euil concord. As for your example, that Iacob sinned not in lying with Lea, because he knewe it not, it is to make no sinne of a double sinne: for Iacob sinned in iudgement.

Nomb. 35. 25

Gen. 29. 23.

ment, not knowing what he did, and so sinned, as vpon the like ignorance for want of regarde, hee might easily haue committed the fowlest incest. Also it cannot bee proued that the bed was altogether vndefiled. To conclude therefore howsoeuer you alledge Austen to approue your definition, it is no way so large as sinne, and therefore a most vnlearned definition. You prouide for some way to escape by these your last woordes: And this is to bee vnderstoode of actual sinne properly, betweene properly and vnproperly, betweene actuall and not actuall, you thinke to finde a defence, because the woordes may be diuersly taken. But if euery thing repugnant to the lawe of God bee sinne in deede, though not actuall, the question is graunted, and nothing left to you, but a warre of woordes against the trueth.

The contrary doctrine followeth: The transgression of the lawe is sinne. Howe taunting ly & how scornefully, doth ý masker play his part? Hee woulde make his reader beleeue I haue made a vowe not to deale plainly in any one thing, and that I can not alleadge one litle sentēce without falsifying. I prayse the Lorde it is farre

1. Iohn 3.4.

from

from me to make any such vowe, or to haue any such vngodly purpose, but labour to approue my cõscience euē to my enemies. That you may haue a proofe hereof, this very place out of S. Joh. which you so wonder at, shal be a witnes, being in sense truly & fitly aleaged to proue it sin, whatsoeuer is against or beside ye law of God. For as sin is the transgression of the law, so again the transgression of the Lawe is sinne: these two are conuerted, as the definition and the thing defined: and as the termes which are mutually verifies one of another. To giue you an example whereof, we say, The Gospel is the power of God to saluation, & againe, The power of God to saluation is the Gospel. As for the transposition, let the same Apostles words be marked, in the fourth chapter, where he sayth, God is a Spirit, yet the wordes lye thus in the Greeke text, a Spirit is God, wherefore let not a transposition seeme strange to you, when you see it bringeth no straunge, but a true sense, neither accuse it as fraudulent when there is no fraude or alteration of trueth. To make some shewe of your false accusation, you say downe a false example: for a man and a living creature, are not

Iohn 4.24.

termes

termes generally verifiedy one of another, being one the generall, and conteyning more, the other the speciall, and hauing lesse. If you had brought an example of the like, it would haue followed wel without any shewe of fraude. For, as Euery reasonable creature is a man, so againe Euery man is a reasonable creature. They that are exercised but a litle in the knowledge of these propositions, may easily see your errour, or purposed deceit in the example, and your false accusation in the matter. But after a false example, let vs see a false conclusion, you conclude saying: So these words as Saint Iohn vtteretb the are most true. Euery sinne is iniquitie or transgression of the lawe, But as I vtter them, you say they are false, to witte, that euery iniquitie or transgression of the law, be it neuer so litle, or done without either consent or knowledge, or by a mad man or bruite beast, should be properly a mortal sinne. Here you playnely conclude that negatiuely, which Saint Iohn him selfe layeth downe affirmatiuely, saying afterwarde in the fift Chapt. Euery iniquitie or transgression is sinne: if sinne, a mortall sinne, as hath bene proued. Thus the Censurer

Ioh.3.4.

1.Ioh.5.17.

surer hath not added, nor altered alone, but playnely denyed that, to condemne mee, which Saint Iohn hath worde for worde, to iustifie mee. All my places that you so condemne, being written and layde together, haue I thanke God, no cause to make mee blushe, but this alone hath cause to moue you to the repentance & recantation of this speache, so directly contrary to the wordes of the holy Ghost. But the Lorde remoove all blindnesse from our eyes, and hardnesse from our heartes, that wee may not struggle agaynst the trueth, and so fall into these grosse denials of the manifest worde of God. You that charge me in this place with transposition, your selfe may be as worthily charged with alteration of the text, putting one verbe for an other, and two wordes for one: both the Greeke and the vulgar translatiõ hath, Euery one that committeth sinne, and you haue agaynst them both, Euery one that sinneth. This you woulde haue made a bolde part in me; but I am contented to graunt it is neither boldnesse nor ignorance in you: for though the first may stande better: yet your translation is not amisse. You thinke perhappes to serue the Lorde in your opinion,

and I knowe I serue the Lorde, his cause is to be had in high estimation, and the examination thereof must be without such disgracing quarrels, otherwise he will punish euen him, that shall not vse good meanes in the handling of a good cause. But to conclude, you graunt the question, though (as you say) it commeth not to be so haynous a blasphemie. For your vsual taunts of confounding and hudling, you may worthily receiue them backe agayne with this vauntage: that you haue manifestly denyed, that which the Apostle doth manifestly affirme: and so stande vpon a contradiction, not onely agaynst my wordes, but agaynst the holy and perfect word of God.

11 In the second poynt the Iesuites doctrine is thus reported: Concupiscence remayning in the regenerate, although it be agaynst the lawe of God, yet is it not sinne properly in it selfe, or of his owne nature. I am charged for mine author, that these wordes, although it bee agaynst the lawe of God, are not founde in the Censure of Colen. To what purpose is the camill agaynst these wordes, which if they had not bene auowd, must neuertheless of necessitie haue bene vnderstooden, for the question

Cens. Col. 38. &c. Canisin opere catech. 184.

is

is of concupiscense against the lawe, and you so take it, and so defend it. Also by your owne graunt, the Iesuites of Colen, expresse those wordes in effect saying: Albeit this concupiscense doe styrre or moue a man sometimes to doe things which are repugnant to the lawe of God: yet if no consent of heart bee yeelded vnto it, it reacheth not to the nature of a mortall sinne, worthy of eternal damnation. That concupiscense which doeth styrre or moue a man to doe thinges against the lawe of GOD, is it not also it selfe agaynst the law? As you thus graunt the words which before were denyed, so vnderhande, or at vnwares you graunt the matter wherwith you are charged. For, saying that concupiscense without consent, reacheth not to the nature of a mortall sinne worthy of eternall damnation, in some sorte you giue vs to vnderstande, that it is neuertheleſſe some kind of sinne, which is to graunt the question, or to loade and disguise the sentence with many waste woordes, that you may in so doing hide the errour. Moreover you and the Iesuites confesse concupiscense to be sinne, by Saint Paules manifest woordes, who as you graunt, some- Rom. 7.

times calleth it sinne. But as you wrangle with mee, so you misconster the Apostle, saying, hee meaneth not that it is a sinne properly, but by a figure. Wherefore his large disputation is shortly to bee layde downe, that thereby it may appeare, howe corruptly you interprete his meaning.

The Apostle hauing declared, that the Lawe doth thorow our corruption worke in vs the lustes & passions of sinne, to meete with a doubt that might bee made against the law as if it were sinne, because though our rebellion it stirreth vs vp thereunto: answereth, saying, The Lawe is holy, and wee solde vnder sinne: the Law spirituall and we carnall. In which answere, it is diligently to be considered by the waye, that were it not holy, and the commaundement holy and iust, and good, euen the Lawe should seeme to bee sinne, for occasion of sinne that commeth thereby though our corruption. But this occasion is not giuen by the Lawe, but altogether taken by our corruption rebelling against the commandement. So the Lawe being of it selfe holy altogether and giuen against sinne, is not to be charged with our rebellion, which is sinfull of it selfe, and prouoked by such re-

Rom. 7. 12. 14.

straint

straine. If the Lawe, which hath in it no sinne nor shadowe of sinne, come notwithstanding to the question of sinne, for the fruite of our corrupt nature pryducked and discouered thereby: what shall wee saye of concupiscence that is it selfe vncleane, and of it selfe maketh sinne exceedingly sinfull? S. Paul following the question, doth open the nature of concupiscence in his owne person, comparing his estate before the knowledge of the tenth commandement with his state afterwarde. Upon which comparison hee declareth, that hee knewe not sinne, till hee knewe the Lawe that saith, Thou shale not couet. He knewe other sinnes before by the Lawe and lighe of nature, but he knewe not concupiscence to be sinne. So the very Gentiles in their Lawes condemned adulterie, murder and other like sinnes: but the iustice of God condemning concupiscence, the Gentiles could not see, the Philosophers could not finde it, neither will the Papistes acknowledge it, although they knowe with the Apostle the Lawe which saith, Thou shalt not couet. Therefore the Apostle hath set before vs by his owne example, what wee may learne by that tenth commandement,

Ibidem.13.

Ibidem vers.7.& cap.3.20.

Plato de leg. lib.6. Item lib.8. contra adul. libro 9. contra homicidia. Leges xii. tab.

which shewth most cleerely ẏ the Lord our God is a spirituall Lawgiuer, binding our spirites, our very thoughtes, & least desires to ẏ obedience of his most holy, most pure, & most perfect Law. If any of these bee beside the Law, it is against ẏ holines, wherein we were created, & which is required of vs by the Lawe, and so plainely and properly a sinne, howsoeuer the Iesuites distinguishe betweene sinne properly so called, & not properly called sinne. Euery sinne is sinne, & these sinnes which by the Iesuites doctrine are so called, figuratiuely (except we finde mercie) they will bring no figuratiue condemnation, in ẏ day when ẏ secretes of all heartes shall be layde open, and wee called to giue an account of euery idle worde.

Mat. 5. 22. 28.

Matt. 12. 36.

Your similitude of the Latine tongue taken out of Austen, is doubtfull, for the tongue is the instrument of speache, and not such a cause. The naturall knowledge of the latin speach, or the knowledge thereof by arte, is the cause. If the tongue were the proper cause, whosoeuer had a tongue should speake latin, because where the cause is, the effect followeth. By which reason your owne woordes againe make concupiscense to bee sinne, saying it is

August. de nup. et concup. lib. 1. cap. 23.

the

the effect of originall sinne, because such as the proper cause is, such is also the proper effect: the cause sinne and sinnefull, the effect also sinne and sinfull. But you that make many demaundes to me, let me aske you what you meant to bring in the example of Christ who is called sinne in the 5. chapter and 2. epistle to the Corinth. for which you falsely quote the 8. in the Roman. Will you make the example like? Shall it expounde the former speach of Saint Paul, calling concupiscense sinne? Surely hereby you proue, that Paul calling concupiscense sinne, meant notwithstanding that it was altogether no sinne: for Christ is altogether no sinne. Againe, how vnlike are these examples; Christ is called sinne, because hee was a sacrifice for sinne, that is, to take away sinne: concupiscense is called sinne, because it is the effect & fruite of originall sinne, not taking it away, but increasing it continually? If you haue conscience of your speach, you would neuer misconster the plaine woordes of the Apostles, & bring nothing for your defence, but such impertinent similitudes. For I appeale to your conscience, may you not as fitly by these similitudes proue, that the Apostle calleth fornication sinne by a figure,

2. Cor. 5. 21.

gure, or any other sinne neuer so great. Saint Austin place, making it no sinne in ye regenerate without consent, is expounded by himselfe afterwarde, saying, Concupiscence is not so forgiuen in Baptisme that it is not sinne, but that it is not imputed as sinne. For a clearer proofe hereof, in another booke hee saith plainely it is sin. For when Iulian obiected that concupiscence is worthy praise, because it is a punishment of sinne: Austen tooke that away by an example of the wicked deuils; who though they, in respect of Gods hande doe iustly punish, yet themselues are vnrust and sinfull, whereupon this similitude followeth, to proue concupiscence sinne, euen when there is no consent: As the blyndnesse of the heart (which God reuoueth, who alone doth illuminate) is both sinne, whereby we beleeue not in God, and the punishment of sinne, whereby a proude heart is punished with worthie punishment, & the cause of sinne, when any euill is committed, by the error of a blind heart: so the concupiscense of the flesh, agaynst which the good spirit lusteth, is both sinne because there is in it a disobedière against the regiment of the minde, and a punishment

Aug. lib. 1. de nup. et concupiscentia. cap. 23. & 25.

Aug. contra Iul. lib. 5. cap. 3. pag. 230. Paris.

ment of sin, because it is rendred to ỳ merites of the disobedient, & the cause of sin, through the defect of that ỳ consenteth, or the contagion of that that springeth. You were deceiued in citing Austen twise, as hauing written but one booke De Nup. et Concup. Clement hath no such place: but against you hee hath these woordes in the booke of his exhortation to the Gētiles speaking of the seuenth commandement among others: Καὶ οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις· ἐπιθυμίᾳ γὰρ μόνῃ μοιχεύεις. Thou shalt not lust, for by concupiscense alone thou hast committed adulterie. Which sentence shewth what a sinne bare concupiscense is, that alone without consent commeth so neere a degree of actuall adulterie. You were also deceiued in quoting Ambrose, for he hath no such place where you cite him. Nazianzen I think, hath no such oration as you dreame of; such is your cause, and such are your testimonies. Wherefore it is false, that all those good fathers are partakers with the Iesuites, of that doctrine which blasphemously maketh the breach of the tenth commandement no sinne. And because you so often presse the worde blasphemie, so seldome vsed by me, you must

Clem. Alexan. 1. lib. Pedago. cap. 6.

Idem adhort. ad gentes. pag. 38.

Amb. lib. 1. de voc. Gent. cap. 5.

vnderstande, that such doctrines, especially now after so great reuelation of the truech, are the doctrines of deuils, blasphemous against God and his holy woorde, which teacheth the contrary, as hath and shall bee further declared.

But nowe followeth the place of Gotuisus, brought to proue the contrary doctrine: Whosoeuer shall see a woman to lust after her, hee hath already committed adulterie with her in his heart. The Censurer in this place to note my ignoraunce, bewrayeth his owne, confounding & hudling the first & last part of the proposition, which in Scholes are called subiectu, and prædicatum. For the question standeth in ꝑ former place, where Christ vseth a word of concupiscence, affirming, that if a man see a woman to lust, or in concupiscence to desyre her, where the force of sinne worketh in the first degree, it is with consent of heart, brought to a further degree, and becommeth actuall adulterie before God, though it bee not actuall before men. Therefore if I had (as you misconster,) alleaged this place of Matthewe altogether in respect of the effect, and as it is a breach of the seuenth commandement, it had

Matth 5.28.

had not made against the doctrine of concupiscense without consent. But I cite it for the former part of the propositiõ, which sufficiently proueth bare concupiscense to bee sinne. For if the consent of the heart make concupiscẽse to be adulterie, thẽ must concupiscense it selfe be also sinne: because otherwise the consent of the heart cannot make any lawful desire to be adulterie: but the fruite and the tree must be of the same nature. Saint James doeth moreouer prouе this: who wil not that a man should say, God tempteth him, and so charge the Lord with sinne: but he turneth vpon man the whole worke and al the blame of sinne, frõ the first sinne of tempting, to the ripe & ful birth thereof. The Apostles wordes in this place are full to make this proofe, calling it a mans owne lust, or lusting: adding moreouer that a man is tempted therwith, drawen away, and as with a baite inticed: which thinges can not bee in bare concupiscense, except it were sinne, and a sinful cause of sinne, from the which James doth carefully quite the Lorde. Also this concupiscense, because it hath tentation, violence and a baite to sinne, before consent of heart be giuen, and before the secret adulterie of

Matt. 12. 33.

Iames. 1. 14.

the

the heart be cõmitted, it cannot be of faith: and therefore the Apostle giueth sentence that it is sin: for whatsoeuer is not of faith is sinne, be it before or after the consent of heart. Therefore out of these woordes of Christ, it is truely proued, by the nature and effect of concupiscense, that it is sinne of it selfe, seeing presently with consent it is made a sinne in so high a degree as is adulterie. Also herein, my alleadging of Scripture is founde to be according to the matter and argument, without any error of doctrine, alteration of sense, or applying it otherwise, then it may be truely and profitably applied: wherefore you gane to much libertie to your penne, in charging mee with common misalleadging of Scripture. But seeing you graunt ꝑ this second poinct of doctrine is also maintemed by the Iesuites, euen in such sort as they are charged, all men may see, It is hard to say whether you are more ready to defẽd their doctrine, or to take a pretensed aduantage of quarell against my woordes.

Rom. 14. 23.

III In the thirde place, the Iesuites are charged to say, The first motions of lust are without hurt of sinne. This third doctrine is graunted by the Censurer as most true

Cens. col. fol. 54. B.

and

and playne: but yet I must not go without some accustomed taunt. Hee chargeth mee that by clipping their wordes, I make euery thing to seeme a Paradox. This is only sayd to accuse, without any shew of proofe. For what benefit was there to mee in leauing out these wordes: If they come of naturall instinct onely, without any cause giuen by vs? or what gayne you by adding them, seeing they are superfluous? For I pray you, are not all the first motions of lust meerely natural, & euermore of some cause giuen by vs, and dwelling within vs, namely the corruption of old Adam? what shiftes are they then which you vse to helpe a weake cause? If to defende this addition of waste wordes, you shall obiect the temptations of Satan offered without any cause giuen by vs: I answere you cannot properly call them motions of lust, being but outwarde prouocations to lust and sinne, wherewith many times a mortified man is not prouoked to lusting & sinning: by which neuertheleſſe, Satan woulde moue, but is resisted by faith, he entreth not in to worke those motions of lust which do affect vs, and whereof our question is moued. Your comparison betweene these first

Mar.7.18. 21. Iames.1.14.

motions

motions of lust and the pulse, making the one to be no more sinne then the other, is without iudgement. For you can not conclude from that part of our naturall soule, wherby we haue life and sense only, to that part wherein our reason and affections are placed, because the former is not in the same sort corrupted as the second: neither doeth sinne so woorke in naturall life and sense, as it doeth in the heare by the corruptions and guiltinesse of the soule. The necessarie actions of life, as eating, drinking, sleepe, breath, also the necessarie actions of sense, as smelling, seeing, hearing, feeling and the rest, they are of themselues al free from sinne, remaining as they were in man before his fall. But euery imagination and cogitation of mans heart is euill euermore, as God testified to Noe: much more the lusts and desires thereof. Wherefore to compare the lustes of sinne to the pulse which is meerely naturall and without sinne, was to bring the simple into a dangerous opinion that the one is as lawfull as the other. For a cleere example of this difference, it may be shewed that Christ had the working of the pulse, and other naturall operations of life and sense, but her

Gen. 6. 5. & 8. 21.

was

was far euen from the least concupiscense, I thinke in your owne iudgement. Therefore this your example of the pulse to defende the first motions of lust, is neyther in substance nor in shewe to any purpose. Moreouer you make the first motions of lust no sinne, because it lyeth not in our power to prohibite them: by which reason you defende sinne by the necessitie thereof. But seeing this necessitie commeth of our selues by our corruption and custome of sinne, how can it be any excuse or defence for the trespasse? what wil you say to originall sinne, shall it be no sinne because it lyeth not in vs to resist it, no more then we can resist our owne conception, and is lesse in our power to resist then the pulse? Like to the former comparison of the pulse is that which followeth, making the first motions of lust to be no more sinne in vs, thē they are in beastes. But this comparison proueth no more then the other: for as there is no law giuen to prohibit the pulse: so there is no lawe to restraine these motions in beastes: but man is tyed to a lawe for euery action last or first, great or small, as is proued by the great commandement: Thou shalt loue the Lorde thy God with Deut.6.5. Mat.22.37.

all

all thy heart, and with all thy soule, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mynde. So that what lust or thought soeuer swarueth from this entire and absolute loue of God, it is against this his commandement, and therefore a sinne against his most soueraigne and most glorious Maiestie, to whome wee owe all the seruice and holinesse of all the heart, of all the mynde, and of al our powers whatsoeuer. Therefore to say wee must not or can not pull in the raynes of our first lustes, or that they are as lawfull in vs. as the pulse, or as they are in bruite beastes: is indeede to reache a beastly libertie and to laye open the way to all vncleannesse without controulement. If all your readers did knowe howe little proofe is made by similitudes, they would all see the insufficiencie of your defence, that so often vse them, and so vnfitly, in place of playne and sure arguments.

Exod.20.17. Now for the tenth commaundement alledged as a contrary doctrine, ꝑ Censuree sayth it is not any way repugnant to that the Iesuits teach. For proofe whereof as the Papistes make of the tenth commaundement two commaundementes, so this fellowe maketh of two seuerall breaches of

two

two diuers commaundementes, but one sinne, and that agaynst the seuenth commaundement onely. But there can not be a commaundement, agaynst the which there is no sinne. Therfore (as it was declared in the former article) there is a sinneful desire first, which is concupiscense agaynst the tenth, the assent whereunto maketh it adulterie, which is a sinne of another degree, and agaynst the seuenth commaundement. So the Censurer must by duetie receyue home agayne his owne taunt of hudling and confounding: for confounding the sinnes of two diuers commandements. Furdermore ý Censurer, being caried awaye into errour by the olde translation against the trueth, and other faithfull translations, woulde proue that the lawe is in our power to doe it, and that therefore these first motions of luste are not forbidden by the tenth commaundement, because it is not in our power to resist them. That his argument may appeare, I will set it downe to be more easily discouered. Whatsoeuer is commaunded, that is not aboue vs, but in our power: to resist the first motions of lust, is not in our power: therefore to resist the first motions of

Matt. 5. 28.

lust

lust is not commaunded. The first proposition is false, and (as I said) a false translatiõ brought to proue it. For Moses saith, The Lawe is not hidden from vs, and the Censurer saith, It is not aboue vs: Moses sheweth, that it is reuealed, the Censurer would proue that it is in our power. Moses speaketh chiefly of the Gospell, and the Censurer referreth it altogether vnto the tenne commandemẽts. But that the place, is both to be translated so, as I haue saide, and to bee applied to the reuelation of the Gospell, it is euidently declared by the plaine text, and by the application thereof in the epistle to the Romanes. Thus the first proposition is false, and drawen both against the wordes of the text, and farre from the sense thereof opened by the Apostle. The seconde proposition is false also: for neither is it true, that all these first motions are altogether out of our power, for the gift of continencie and mortification doth more and more subdue them: neither doth it followe, that wee are not subiect to the Lawe for such offences as wee can not resist, the fault being ours through corruption, why wee can not resist them. Shall not a wholesome lawe made for drunkardes

Deut. 30. 11.

Rom. 10. 6.

Rom. 6. 2, 4, 14.

Item. 7. 4.

drunkards, stand in force against him that hath so accustomed him selfe to the sinne, that now it is impossible for him to abstaine. Shall we iustifie our euill thoughtes? Vnlaule it is not in our power to thinke a good thought. Except you will in some sort iustifie the Manichees and Pelagians, you must condemne these opinions. For if you and your fellowes bring these false & daungerous propositions to make vnto conclusions, and venture thus vpon so corrupt interpretations, it wilbe easie for you, both to write at will, and to dispute at large. Austens opinion against lust, euen before the consent, appeareth by the places alledged before, and in many other places: therefore his owne answere serueth to expounde this place. I doubt not but Austen which forbiddeth the disease of lusting, will much more forbidde the consent and following of such sinfull steppes. In these questiõs of cõcupiscẽce & the first motiõs of lust, a little feeling of a good conscience would cut off all this contention of speach. For if they that teache otherwise, would looke into the Law, Thou shalt not couet, with such eyes as Saint Paul did, and would also consider the corruption, the

2.Cor.3.5.

Aug. contra Iul.lib.5. cap. 3. & lib.1.de nup. & concup. cap.25.

Exod.20.17.

Rom.7.7.

force and fruites of originall sinne, and moreouer regarde the power of Gods entier and perfect iustice which is iustly prouoked with the least offence, because hee made vs in the greatest perfection, they would then speake no more in defence of the vncleane concupiscence of an vncleane heart: but would with Saint Paul confesse, that the Lawe, Thou shalt not couet, teacheth vs to knowe sinne, not onely that grosse sinne knowen and punished among infidels, but somewhat more, that flesh and blood cannot acknowledge, euen that all concupiscence & all vncleane lust is sinne, because God is a spirituall Lawegiuer, who bindeth our spirit, and bringeth all our desires into obedience, restraining the least motions of vncleane cõcupiscence by this holy and streight commandement, Thou shalt not couet.

Mat. 5.19. Iam. 2.10.

Exod. 20.17. Rom. 7.7.

Rom. 7.14. Ioh. 1.26.

IIII In the fourth place it commeth to bee examined, how litle authoritie the Iesuites giue to the worde of God, and howe much they attribute to vnwritten beleefe. They are charged to saye, The holy scripture is a doctrine vnperfect, maimed, lame, not conteining all things necessary to fayth and saluation. Wherein you censure mee

Cens. Col. 820.

as being to shameles in setting forth these for the Iesuites wordes, Howsoeuer Gotusius report or misreport the Iesuites, if I report him faithfully, it is no shame to me: but to you it is some blame, still to charge me with that is none of mine. As for the question, you handle it subtillie, reporting not your owne iudgement, but with some corruption what Honhemius saith, and againe what the Iesuites answere, whereas you are in the name of the Iesuites, eyther to graunt that the scripture is perfect, and conteyneth all thinges necessarie to saluation, which is cōtrary to the Councill of Trent: or els plainely and without perhappes to set downe the thinges that are to be beleeued of necessitie, and yet not comprehended in the scripture, which is clearely to graunt that which before you denied: for the scripture is maymed and wanteth, if any substantial doctrine of faith belonging to a Christian man, bee left out. There followe twelue particular pointes, which you make of one sort to be beleeued, and affirme them, but with perhappes, to be deduced out of scripture: of the which seuen are, not by perhappes, but vndoubtedly conteyned in the word: as that there

Sess. 4. Decre. de Can. scriptur.

Rom.1. 3. 4. Mat 26.39. Ioh.15.25. are two natures and willes in Christ: that the holy Ghost proceedeth frō the father and the sonne without generation. Thirdly (which you vtter in woordes that are obscure and vnsound) that the woorde did take the nature of mā to be one person & not the person: Fourthly, that infantes are to be baptised: Fifthly, the change of the Sabaoth: So also we receiue the foure Gospels, and the epistle to the Romanes, as approoued out of the woorde, by the inscription there expressing the names of the writers thereof. For your darke woordes out of Thomas, howe the father begate the sonne, I wishe cleare and perfect woordes in so high a mysterie. We beleeue by testimonie of the woorde, that Iesus Christ is the onely begotten sonne of the Father, and God aboue all to bee prayseed for euer. That I may refraine other speach, I pray you examine your heart before the Lorde, you that dare teach that these most high mysteries of God the Sonne and God the holy Ghost, are not reuealed in ye scriptures, so farre as they concerne our faith, but stande vpon the warraunt of mens traditions. The rest of these twelue points, as they are not euidently conteyned in the

Iohn 1.14. Gen. 17. 12. Rom.4.11. Apoc.1.10.

Iohn 1.1.

Rom.9.5.

woorde,

woorde, so a Christian is not absolutely bounde to beleeue them: as that the common Creede (the articles whereof notwithstanding we beleeue as grounded vpon the Apostolicall doctrine) was made by the Apostles: the celebration of Easter day vpon a Sunday: the perpetuall virginitie of the blessed Virgin. The Epistle to the Laodiceans, although many make mention of it, Paul maketh none: so that eyther you ignorantly passed ouer the Greeke, or wilfully addicted your selfe to the olde translation, being in this place playnely corrupted. For by the originall, Paul speaketh of an epistle frō Laodicea, and not written to the Laodiceneses, as you vntruely affirme. Nowe what haue you gayned by all or any one of these twelue notes, seeing they are al eyther proued by ỳ Scriptures & thē no warrant for your traditions & vnwittē verities: or not necessary points of our faith, and therfore not of like authoritie to the holy writings of the Apostles and Prophetes? After this sort you may easily publish A briefe Censure, confounding and hudlyng together without distinction, matters of our beleefe, with things which we are not bound to beleeue:

Col.4.16.

and articles playnely conteyned in Scripture, with points that are not there at all.

The place, foloweth, alleadged to ouerthrow the former doctrine of the Iesuites.

2. Tim. 3. 16. All the Scripture is giuen by inspiration of God, and is profitable to teache, to confute, to correct & to instruct in iustice, that the man of GOD may be perfect, and throughly instructed to euery good work. Here ye Censurer hath brought his cole to set his markes vpon my translation, which is neuertheleſſe so faithfull, that no one of ye fiue words by him so marked, as wickedly added, can wel be wanting without some iniury to the text, or to the propertie of our language in expressing the same. In translating, the propertie of euery tongue is to be obserued: for as tongues differ in language, so they differ in their peculiar forme & order of words. That which may be well vnderstoode in one tongue, must needes be supplied in an other. And to translate word for worde, is to haue the wordes English or Frenche, when yet the phrase shall remaine Greeke or Hebrewe, and be as litle vnderstoode. Yet this is that obscure and fruitelesse translation which the Censurer exacteth at my hand. But let vs see how iustly.

All

All scripture is not so plaine as All ye scripture: and the Censurer ofte saith, the scripture. The verbe is must be supplied, whether you regard the English tongue or Logicke: for the copulative coniunction following in ye Greeke, doth make the whole proposition compound and not simple. Otherwise what sense or sentence were it to say: all scripture giuen by inspiration of God, & profitable to teach, &c. The addition of this verbe was so necessarie, that the vulgar translation addeth it in the seconde place, but by no better reason, then why it should be added in both. The first (and) was childishly and vnlearnedly noted as superfluous, being expressed in the Greeke text, and corruptly left out by the olde translation, which deceiued you. The wordes and throughly were added, the one to ioyne the sentence, and the other to expresse the force of the compound word which Paule vseth, signifying throughly or perfectly perfect. In this signification is the compound vsed in many other places also. Thus you see I misuse not the Scriptures in this place, for my translation is sufficiently approoued, and some faultes bewaied in the old translation, and ignorance in your Censure. Ne-

ἐξαρτισμένος. Actes 21.5. Matt. 21. Psal. 8. 3. 1. Thes. 3. 10.

nevertheleſſe, I muſt remember you, that it was your ouerſight to leaue out ꝑ note of a third (and) which might aſwell haue bene ſet vpon your ſcore with the reſt, and raiſed the number vp to ſixe. Alſo you that ſo exact a ſtraight tranſlation of worde for word, why did you not Cenſure me for adding v. wordes at one clap in this ſentence to expreſſe one Greeke worde: Paul hath [illegible] which is word for worde, Godinſpired: I haue to expreſſe it vſed v. wordes, giuen by inſpiration of God. But your Cenſurers eye may without blame paſſe ouer the ſight of ſuch ſmall matters. I craue pardon of my Reader, that I haue bene drawen on into ſo trifeling poyntes. But he hath beene exercised in ſifting and ſhifting to finde ſomwhat, ꝑ may ſerue his turne, and yet greatly miſſeth of his purpoſe: if he were ſo ſearched, perhaps hee would not eaſely anſwere it. Now againſt my tranſlation he vſeth words, that ſhould be by a new worde called railetiue ſpeache in me, ſaying, If I had vſed ſuch audacitie in tranſlating Aeſopes fables, it woulde haue bene tollerable, but in tranſlating the Scripture it is impious. Surely if the Cenſurer had bene well cenſured, and exercised

in

in translating Aesopes fables, when hee went to the Grammer schoole, hee woulde haue bene better acquainted with Greeke phrases, and the translation of the new Testament. But it may be, he hateth the kingdome and skill of Grammarians. Thus much to answere my translation which you haue so vnlearnedly marked, and so vnmustly cõdemned. Now it followeth to consider what you bring agaynst the alleadging of that place to reproue the Iesuites doctrine, and your vnwritten verities.

Your first reason, ꝑ this place is not full ynough to proue ꝑ sufficiencie of ꝑ Scripture, for which it is alleaged, standeth vpon one word in ꝑ text, where the Apostle saith, the Scripture is profitable, and hath not the worde sufficient. But you say these are two diuers thinges, to bee sufficient for a purpose, and to be profitable for it, as may appeare in meate which is profitable for our lyfe, yet wee cannot saye it is sufficient, because it alone, without naturall heate, clothes and other meanes sufficeth not. Whereupon you leaue the reader to conclude that this place is too slender for my purpose. The force of which your reason is of the difference of these two words,

affir-

affirming that profitable, is not so much as sufficient. Whereunto I answere, that as some times it is true which you affirme, and as it appeareth in your example: so of the other part it is true, that many times a thing may be saide profitable for a purpose, where profitable shal impoze sufficient and not barely profitable: as for example, when some reason is adioyned why it shoulde be profitable and nothing else applyed or serving to that effect. For proofe hereof when the Apostle writeth that Godlines is profitable to all things hauing the promises of this life & of the life to come: it can not be denyed, but by profitable here, he meaneth it is sufficient for all things: that is for the obtepning of all good thinges: which sense of this worde is prooued by that which followeth of the effect, hauing the promises of both lyues. For if godlinesse bypng all good things of this lyfe and of the lyfe to come, it must needes folowe that the Apostle saying, it is profitable to all things, vnderstoode it was so fully sufficient, that hee which hath it, needeth not the supplie of any thing else. For like reason in this place, I say, the Apostle speaking of the Scripture, as profitable for doctrine for confutation,

1. Tim. 4. 8.

tution, for correction and reformation, by profitable, vnderstandeth sufficient. If your example were of the like, it woulde proue the same. If as meate and drinke are profitable to nourish, so they were profitable also to cloth, to giue rest and to make a man perfectly healthie and strong to euery good action: I woulde also conclude vpon such causes that it were both profitable and sufficient to maintaine life. But you standes in deede of an other Censurer, to Censure your comparisons and examples so often brought in, easily to deceiue the reader, that doth not see howe vnequallie they are poked, as like thinges to make like proofe, being in deede vnlike and of vnlike effectes. To returne vnto the text, the sufficiencie of scripture is moreouer prouued by the wordes which goe before and followe. Before the Apostle had sayde that all the Scripture is inspired of God: whereupon he inferreth, and is profitable to teach for doctrine and confutation: as if he had sayde, it is profitable to teache the trueth and reproue errour. The strength of which reason lyeth in this, that the light of knowledge which sometime was in man by his creation, is damped and gone out: in

that

that nowe wee haue no meanes (except God by his holy Spirite doeth inspire vs) to discerne betweene trueth and vntrueth, or betweene good and euill. Nowe this heauenly knowledge, which (as Saint Pe-
2.Pet.1.21. ter sayeth) was vttered by the holy men of God, inspired with the holy Ghost, is recorded in the bookes of holie Scripture. Whereupon it foloweth that these bookes of the holy worde, and no other, being the authenticall words of the heauenly knowledge, which God inspired the holy Prophets and Apostles withall, are so sayde to be profitable to teache the trueth, as it noteth this to bee proper to the holy Scripture, and not to agree to any other whatsoeuer. Therefore if these bee the writings which contayne the wisedome, wherewith God hath inspired his holy men, for such vse of the Church, as is here spoken of, it must needes followe, the knowledge which God hath reuealed, being sufficient for vs, that these holy Scriptures conteining the same knowledge, is lykewise sufficient. Whereby it appeareth that this cause here noted, (to wite of inspiration from God) being the proper cause of the holy Scriptures, and not common to any other wri-

kings whatsoever, doth implie the effect also folowing in this place, of teaching, disproving and making perfecte the man of God, to be likewise proper vnto them: and (which I vndertoke to proue) profitable in this place to signifie as much as sufficient.

To this I adde an other reason out of the wordes which followe: wherein because not some things onely which may in parte make a man perfect, are attributed to the scriptures, and some other thinges left to bee supplied by other meanes: but all things whatsoeuer may bee needefull for vs, are sayde to be perfected by the Scriptures, it must needes follow, that the scripture alone is sufficient. For that which is profitable to al the partes, which may be required to perfection, cannot be but sufficiet for the perfection of the whole: but that the Scripture is profitable in such maner, the Apostle doth fully declare, both in rehearsing all the particular partes which are necessarie, and adding also after generally, that the man of God may be perfect. To this purpose the Apostle hath so set his wordes, as hee could not more effectually by any other speach. For he teacheth, that it

is

Righteousnes. is profitable to make perfect, which yet is made more full by the compound worde adioined, the grace and force of which composition (as was noted before) is to note perfection added to perfection, and to signifie throughly, or perfectly perfect, and that, as hee addeth, for all good workes. This is yet made more full and more waightie by that hee speaketh not here of the cõmon perfection of all men, but of the perfection of the man of God, that is of the Minister. If the scripture conteine knowledge to make the Minister throughly perfect, for euery part of his office, both in doctrine soundly to teach the trueth, and to confute and remoue error: and in life to reforme and correct that which is amisse, and to instruct in that which is righteous and holy, how much more is it sufficient for the cõmon knowledge of other men, in whom like perfection of vnderstanding is not so much required.

To these two reasons, because the question is of importance, I will yet adde one other out of the verse next going before. There the Apostle vseth an argument to perswade Timothy to abide in ye doctrine of the holy Scriptures, for proofe of which argument

argument, this seuetteenth verse is immediately adiopned. His argument is takē from the effect of these holy writings, wherein Timothie had been brought vp frō a child. Which effect is this, that through faith in Christ Iesus they are of abilitie or of power, or of sufficiencie to make him wise to saluation. For the Apostle sayeth expressely, that the Scriptures are able, or of power, or sufficiencie (for all these speaches I take to bee of one signification) wherunto? to make him wise: how farre? euen to saluation, that is to teache him all wisedome needeful to saluation. Wherupon, as I sayd, the Apostle immediatly hingeth in this sentence, that All the Scripture is giuen by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, &c. Which must either be sayde to bee impertinent to the former matter of the power or sufficiencie of the Scripture to saluation (which I thinke no man of any reason will affirme) or els it must be confessed, that the Apostle added it for greater plainnes, or for an other proofe. For whether of both it be brought in, it is absurde to bring the lesse to set out, or proue the more. And seeing the Apostle had spoken in the former verse of the sufficiencie

2. Tim. 3. 15

of

of Scripture, to saye nowe it bringeth but some profite to that purpose, were to saye lesse then he had said before, Wherefore he saying it is profitable, setteth it out as alone and sufficiently profitable, being inspired of God, and sanctified by his promise and ordinance, to make perfect the man of God to al heauenly wisedome. Finally, the Apostle hauing put into Timothies hande al compleat, necessarie and sufficient furniture, speaketh neuer a whit of your church reuealed veryties, but onely of the scripture inspired of God. Therefore either he teacheth and concludeth insufficiently: or els the Scripture is sufficiently, wholly, powerfully, and in truth onely profitable.

For your second reason, I denie that the newe Testament is therefore superfluous, because the olde was sufficient. For this bountifull addition, or accesse of scripture by the Newe Testament, is not to impeach the perfection and profitable sufficiencie, or sufficient profitablenes of the olde Testament, seeing the Fathers were aswell saued, as we are now vnder the Gospell, but for a more full, euident, and cleare reuelation of that, which though to saluation it was sufficient before, yet could not shewe

the

the infinite riches of Gods goodnesse toward vs, so plainely & so fully as these doe. Iob had sufficient in his greatest want, and no superfluitie in his greatest aboundance. A morning light is sufficient for a man to doe his worke by, yet the brightnesse of the sunne is not therefore needeless and superfluous: for it serueth to giue a clearer, a more certaine and more comfortable direction then the other. For your by matter, that the wordes omnis and tota, differ in Greeke and Latine, for proofe wherof you appeale to all Logicioners, I dare warrant you they will all condemne your opinion. For omnis homo signifieth euery man, but omnis populus (which is the Vulgar translation) doth not signifie euery people: neyther can you translate the woordes of Saint Luke concerning the taxing that euery earth, or euery worlde should bee taxed: in which places the Euangelist vseth the same worde, the vse wherof in ϩ greeke you did not vnderstand. Therefore if you can salue this matter of manifest errour, I will acknowledge my selfe to deale deceitfully as you charge me. An other point followeth like the rest already answered. But the Censurer thus repeateth. Saint Paul

Luk 21.38.

Luke 2.1.

must vnderstand part of the scripture and not the whole, because all was not then written: also nowe wee can not take the Apostles wordes as vttered of all, because much scripture is now wanting as he doth imagine. Should these be your plaine arguments if you could obteine disputation? Should this be the shorter waye? I know not your name, but know I pray you and teach your fellowes to knowe, that the scripture hath bene in all ages sufficient for the time wherein it was written: of all that which hath by seuerall encreases bene written, nothing was at any time superfluous: and whatsoeuer hath bene written and not come to our handes, nothing for all that is now missing, that is necessary vnto saluation. He that hath not giuen vs the bookes of Nathan, Gad, Achia the Shilonite, and Iehdo (if they wrote any other then partes of the two bookes of Samuel after his death, & of the first booke of the Kings) also he that hath not giuen vs the rest of Salomons Prouerbes, (to passe by your ouersight concerning the epistle to the Laodiceans, already noted) therefore gaue them not, because he knewe them not necessarie or expedient for the posteritie. John wo-

1.Chro.29. 29.
2. Chro.9. 29.
1.Reg.4.31.
Iohn.21.25.

teth this in the conclusion of his Gospell, and Christ teacheth that they which had Moses and the Prophets, euen then had sufficient without miracles and traditions. And you haue no sound opinion of the wisdome and mercie of God, if you thinke his maiestie to leaue any age, since he chose a peculiar people, voide of scripture, profitable and sufficient to the saluation of his Church. Thus the reader may see that I neither wrest the former place agaynst my selfe, neither can you doe it, that would so faine. Luke 16. 20.

In the fifth article the Iesuites are reported to say, The want of holy scriptures must be supplied by peecing it out by traditions. For the report of this doctrine, the Censurer bestoweth more of his vndeserued tauntes. If the Censure of Colen hath no such wordes, Gotuisus failed in citing their booke, but failed not in charging them with their owne doctrine, which all Iesuites and Papistes so vpholde as Peters chaire, both to mainteine their false doctrines, and to vnderset their Antichristiã tyrannie. But although you would for the time dissemble the matter, traditiõs are not of so smal force, as to peece out the V Cens. Col. 220.

want of scripture. For, except the Presidēt of ye Trent council haue a forge to coyne lies, traditions are a liuing Gospel: and hee vttereth it as a question that can not be denied. This is most true (saith Hosius) that if traditions be reiected, the very Gospell also seemeth to be reiected: for what els are traditions, then a certaine liuing Gospell? In deede traditions make a quicke court at the Vaticane. Thus by your doctors opinion it is most true, ye traditions are made not a supplie to any wants in ye Gospel, but an other liuing Gospel, after a sort to giue life to that which in ye true Gospell seemeth to be dead. And may not a man wout a lie call this doctrine blasphemous? My vttering of ye Cōmandemēt in the singular number is without additiō or alteration of sense. For Moses in the same Chapter, speaking of the same lawe and to the same men, doth change the plurall number into the singular. The selfe same Lawe also is recited in the singular number in the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomie, & by Salomon, in the thirtieth chapter of his Prouerbes: and euermore that which is said to al is also said to euery one, and truly taken as vttered to euery one. Surely I can-

Hosius lib. 4. de. trad. fol. 388.

Deut. 12. 32.

Pro. 30. 6.

cannot guesse what you imagined at this change of the Lawgiuers wordes, without change of the sense, being done by the example of the same Lawgiuer in another place, and without any breach of his Lawes and wherupon your vttermost malice could inferre none absurditie in sense, none iniurie to the scripture, nor aduantage to my cause, but a stinging guesse insinuating some cause moueing mee to this change, which whether you cõcealed as forbearing me, or ashamed on your own behalfe to bewrye, the indifferent reader iudgeth. Againe, what made you adde so hainous a slaunder, as if all thinges were lawfull for me? and to charge me, as blaming the Apostles and Euangelistes for adding the Gospel? Take heede you allowe not your selfe such scope in these suggestions manifestly agaynst the truth and your owne conscience, for you knowe what that sentence implieth, Blessed is he that condemneth not him selfe in that thing which hee alloweth. The Lorde that addeth grace to grace, and light to light, he also hath added to the lawe, the fulnesse and satisfaction thereof in Christ Jesus, which is published in his most holy and most perfect Gospell.

Rom. 14. 22.

Rom. 10. 4.
1. Tim. 3. 16.

Deut. 4. 2. To expounde Moses wordes, forbidding to adde or take away from the Lawe as spoken of the things he deliuered by word of mouth, and not of the lawe written, is a doubtfull speaking, and may beare a harder conclusion, then I will charge you with. His cõmandement respected the lawe eyther pronounced or written by him, or afterwarde to bee preached and written by the holy Prophets and Apostles in the spirite of God. I dare appeale to your conscience, though it be deliuered from your pen, you do not thinke in your heart, that I woulde haue no scriptures beleeued, besides that which Moses set downe. Wherefore your proofe needed not in this matter. To conclude, it is a great iniquitie to adde traditions, or your vnwritten verities to the written worde of God, whereunto no man may adde, because nothing is wanting: from which no man can take, because nothing is superfluous: but to him that addeth, shal the curses written in the booke be added forever.

Apoc. 22. 18.

VI In the first place the Iesuites wordes are thus reported: The holy Scripture is a nose of waxe. At the true report of this blasphemous doctrine, you fall into a

Cens. Col. 117.

storme,

storme, perswading that I haue therein sinned agaynst God and abused the Iesuites, with other most bitter woordes: as if I tooke the way to ouermatch both learning and trueth. But howe wrongfully all these woordes are cast out against me, your owne woordes beare witnesse: for presently after the sentence of condemnation, you repeale it and acquite me of the faulte: graunting, that as a nose of waxe, may bee formed what way and to what forme one list, so naughtie men may wrest the Scriptures. Notwithstanding, because you presse the woordes against me, let them be examined. First to proue that the Iesuites haue them more plainely then you will acknowledge, I appeale from your Censure, to Andradius playne confession. Hee (as you knowe) defended the Iesuites in these poyntes agaynst Kemnitius, which you defende against mee: and hath lent you no small furniture for this seruice. This Andradius (as hauing more learning, and in his kinde more true dealing then you) in handling this article, doth not at all cry out as you doe, but acknowledgeth and defendeth the matter without such neede lesse scoffes. And for the words he confesseth saying: The fathers of Colen

Paiuas Andrad. orth. expl. lib. 2. pag. 104.

I graunt, do say, in the place which Kemnitius citeth, that the holy Scripture is as a nose of waxe. The worde (as) may indifferently bee put in, or left out, and the sense all one, as shall be proued. But let vs leaue the wordes and followe the matter. Seeing it is now cleere that the Iesuites say, the Scriptures are as a nose of waxe, what shall we say? Is this the Censurers Censure, or the Iesuites doctrine? may the worde of God, may the word of power, the vnchangeable word of God, may it (I say) be compared to pliant, changeable & melting waxe? Is it in the worde so to receiue diuers & contrary senses, as the waxe receiueth in trueth, and not by misconstering or mistaking of the eyes, contrary formes, or printes from contrary seales? shall Iesuites maintaine this directly or indirectly in a kingdome, where the Gospel is preached? I appeale herein to the conscience of all that loue the trueth: though a naughtie Iesuite for flatterie of the Pope, or other Heretike to deceiue people, may wrest and peruert the scripture, yet Saint Peter teacheth, it shall be to his owne destruction, and the Scripture notwithstanding shall remaine perfect and vndefiled. For the worde doeth not worke it selfe, ea-

2. Pet. 3. 16.

selp

selfe to receiue and holde euery forme as waxe doeth, but the truetb of the whole Scripture maintenneth the truetb of euery branch, it taketh away the Lampe, and resisteth the print of any forged violent interpretation. Euery sentence in the Word of God, is as the arme of a mightie Oke that cannot be broken off, but if you bowe it by force, the bowing will appeare, and the more you force it to come about to your bent, the mightier it is to recouer itselfe and returne againe to his owne course and growth, and that with perill to him, that offered such violence. I couldo not passe from this place easely, because this blasphemous doctrine doeth in the Church of Rome (I meane the Popish Church, for otherwise I doubt not but God hath his Church in Rome, as he had in Englande, when all Englande seemed to bee Rome) because I say this intollerable abasing and abusing the power and allsufficiencie of the holy Scripture, doeth in the Popish Church, mainteyne the mysterie of vngodlynesse: it stoppeth vp the fountaine of liuing waters, and prepareth cisternes and ditches in place thereof: it chaungeth the milke and water of life mentioned in Esay, into the cuppe of fornications described

Iere. 2. 13.

Esai. 55. 1.

Reue. 17. 4.

bed in the Reuelation: finally the traditions of man must ouerrule the trueth of God. But let vs see what followeth. The Censurer graunteth mee and I graunt him agayne, that the wordes are spoken in a similitude, and I alleadged them in no other sense: yet hee woulde inforce it vpon me, and vpon his reader to beleeue, that I shoulde absurdely make the Iesuites say, the Scripture is a nose of waxe, without regard of resblance. But he cannot so much as make my wordes a nose of waxe, to receiue this his counterfeited stampe & false interpretation. And for his obiectiõ, it is waste, saying: Although Christ be likened to a Serpent, yet he is no Serpent, and to a couetous man, yet he is none. For who doeth at all affirme that which hee doeth confute so carefully? And touching the first obiection, which is like the seconde, where is it sayde that Christ is lyke a Serpent? True it is, the lifting vp of the brasen Serpent in the wilderness, is compared to the lifting vp of the sonne of man: which will not warrant the wordes of your Censure. It is moreouer one thing to cõpare that speciall sacrament and signe of the brasen Serpent to Christ, and to com-

Numb. 21. 9.
John 3. 14.

pare

pare Christ to a serpent generally. Thus you haue picked out an example, that in shewe seemeth to make for you, but is in deede against you: as I may also say of ꝑ second, touching ꝑ couetous man. But howe many examples are against you in this matter? Christ is likened to a vine, and we may say Christ is a vine: he is likened to a shepeheard, & he is a shepheard: God is likened to a consuming fire, and thereupon it is written, God is a consuming fire. Yea against your example, Christ is likened to the brasen serpent, and we may say he is that brasent serpent lifted vp from the earth at his passion, to drawe all to him selfe. But that you may not haue here the vantage of two letters, nowe I haue giuen you your libertie to say what you can, I will not yeeld that the word (as) is left out in the Colen Censure. For Payua, as loth as you to grant ꝑ trueth, doeth yet at last report the wordes altogether as I doe, adding the like out of Pighius, your doctors words are: when the fathers of Colen, considered that there were many places in the holy Scriptures, whose true sense doth not easily appeare, but that euery man may at his pleasure drawe them into variable & diuers senses,

John 15.1.
John 10.11.
Heb.12.29.
Deut.4.24.
Iohn 3.14
Payuas Andrad.orth. explic.lib.2. pag.107.

in

in a most apt similitude they called it a nose of wax. And Pighius. The leade rule of the Lesbian building. By these two places Papuas Andradius hath brought you into some worthy suspition of charging me for my error without cause in other places as well as in this. But now wherin have I abused the Iesuites learned or unlearned? What have I here sayde, that one of your doctors doeth not mowe? what have I done to ouermatch a trueth, in defending the unchangeable trueth of the scriptures against your doctrine, teaching that heretiques may command and frame the word of truth, as wax is commanded and framed to what forme they list. Mome commeth somewhat to make sport, if the gravitie of the matter did not require feare and reuerence. The Censurer supposeth me, to have had but one Bible, & that of the olde translation onely, which hath, The Lawe of the Lorde is immaculata vndefiled, or as hee translateth vnspotted, voide of filth and dishonestie. Whereupon the matter is debated at large, what ye latine worde immaculata doth signifie beyonde sea (where the Censurer woulde dissemblingly seeme to be) and what it should signifie here in England.

Psal. 19.7.

land. A solemne preparation to make shew of a victorie which the Censurer will haue ouer his owne imagination. I shal be conuinced for false translation of that I translated not, and for ill handling that I touched not. I may as well be censured for the translation of Stapyhlus, or Lindans slaunders, as for the translation of the word immaculata. The original hath, the Lawe of the Lord is perfect, and the best translations haue so translated it. Your olde translation doth go alone: the Lxx. followe the rest. Wherefore this place out of Dauid doth shewe that the scripture is perfect, and maintaineth her perfection against all corruptions, as a right line sheweth it self, and bewrayeth that which is crooked. Thus you see I translate not your olde translation in this place with fraude or without fraude. Somewhat you imagined in a vreame, & colde it before you were awake.

In the seuenth article the Iesuites are reported thus to teach: The reading of the holy Scripture, is not only not profitable, but many wayes very hurtfull to the Church. Here the Censurer would seeme to venie the doctrine, that in so doing hee may both somewhat couer the absurditie, and

VII

Cen. Col. fol. 118.

and accuse me for my author, as misreporting the same. Yet after a storme of needelesse wordes, hee doth in effect graunt the matter. But his maner is for some aduantage to report their doctrines otherwise then they are taught or brought into question. For the Papistes doe restraine the common people from reading the Scriptures, vsing many reasons to proue them hurtful. Besides other your bookes to this purpose, there is one worthie of remembrance written to ỳ Parliament in Queene Maries time, where fiftie reasons, such as they be, are brought, not onely to keepe the people from the Scriptures, but for a more sure waye, to keepe the Scriptures from them, not suffering the translation thereof in the English tongue. Wherupon the question wee haue in hand is this: whether the reading of Scriptures be hurtful, and therefore to bee forbidden. Nowe the Censurer saith the rash and vnconsiderate reading is forbidden, which is from the matter. We doe not ioine issue in this, whether the people shoulde rashly reade them, or without consideration: but whether you may make men beleeue that the reading of holy scriptures is hurtfull, and therefore to be

Sean dishes booke entituled, A discourse whether it be expedict that the scripture should be in English.

be restrayned. There is no doubt but you holde both, and teach both carefully, as appeareth by a late Iesuites booke written of this matter: yet in disputation you woulde seeme onely to forbid the rash and unadvised reading, whereof we make no question. But your reason is to be layde downe: Whatsoever may hurt, though it be in no fault, yet it is to be restrayned: the worde of God hath done such hurt: therefore it is to be restrayned. So you may aswell take away the foode of the body, that body and soule may perish together, because men may surfeit by good meates, and fall into drunkennes by wholsome wine. Here let me for the scriptures sitly plead against you, your owne rule pleaded in an other place for Philosophie. It is say you, a grosse ignorance, for an abuse that may be, to condemne the things which bee excellent gifts of God, and sparks of his most high and infinite wisdom. If this be true, then is it a blasphemie for an abuse not at all growing by the worde, yet to forbidde the vse thereof, and to keepe it in an vnknown tongue, in a barbarous translation, and to condemne, not sparkes of Gods most high and infinite wisedome, but to condemne

Iacobus Ledesima de diuin. scrip. quæstion. non Legendis.

06

euen

euen that high and infinite wisdome it selfe, by making such restraintes and taking such sure wayes to debarre the children of God, from the most necessary euidences of their heauenly inheritance. But in this question agayne, Payua doth deale more plainely to the purpose then the Censurer, who borowing of Payua this place also, yet leaueth out all that, which maketh not to his purpose, of couering and shielding the Iesuites from the truth that fighteth against them. For Andradius plainely confesseth, that this is the first argument of the Iesuites, why the Scriptures should not be read, because (as the Iesuites teach) they haue giuen occasion to all heresies. A very strange assertion: but howsoeuer vnlearned and vnstable men deale, yet the Scripture giueth no occasion of heresie, much lesse of all heresies, as these fellowes doe thus openly maintaine. Therefore the Iesuites, in teaching that such harme commeth by reading the word of God, accuse the scriptures as hurtful many wayes, and not profitable, which is asmuch as they are charged withall in the 7. place. The Censurer commonly falleth in leauing the question, and proueing that which is not

Psal. 18. 8, 20. &c. & 119. 129.

Payuas Andrad. lib 2. orthodox. expl. pag. 217.

called

called into doubt: as in this place hee proueth that the worde is without all fault, when men misconster it, or founde heresies vpõ the misunderstanding of it. This was not in question: yet it is wel prooued & fitly to ouerthrowe the former doctrine of Iesuites: for, if the scripture be in no fault, restraine not the Scripture, but reforme the wrangling and peruerting wit: if it be in no fault, it is neither the occasion of all heresies, nor a nose of waxe. Your exãple of Christ is rashly & truely returned against you. For as Christ is a ruine to none, but to those that receiue him not, and to those that beleeue not in him: so the Scripture hurteth not, but those that despise the reading, the hearing and the practise thereof. Psal. 11. Esa. 8. 1. Pet. 2. 7. 2. Cor. 2. 15.

The contrary doctrine is alleaged out of Matthew, Yee erre, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. The Censurer woulde ouerthrowe the application of this place by two circumstances, one to proue the worde particular: the other because (as he sayth) Christ spake not to the ignorãt people, but to learned Sadducees. Touching the first circumstance, although the Censurer doth well lay vnto the particular application of Christ, ye- Mat. 22. 29.

speet of the present matters and hearers, yet it will bee founde more then auaritie for any man, so to restraine the doctrines of Christ deliuered in particular, that they must reach no further then the present circumstances of the matter, and of those disciples or aduersaries to whome hee spake: for this is nothing els, but to make Christ a Prophet for a time, & not a Prophet for euer. Also by that interpretation his wonderful workes, & most heauenly doctrines, shall bee made to vs nothing els, but a bare and naked story, to tell vs what Christ taughe others, and not what he hath taught vs: and to declare what hee reprehended in them, not what he reprehenderh in vs. But the Censurer will answere, hee meaneth not to tie other doctrines to the particular circumstances. And why not any other sentence as well as this to the Sadducees? for nothing can be more generall then errour, nothing more vniuersall then the ignorance of Scriptures; which is I thinke, in ye Censurers iudgement the fountaine of all errour. How commeth it then that he will stop so generall streame, restrayning that to a feiw, which appertaineth to all? And for the Sadducees, they did

did not only erre in the doctrine of ye resurrection, but were otherwise enemies, & ignorant of Christ, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God to saluatiõ in him. Wherefore Christ noted vpõ one particular occasion, ye fountaine of al their blindnesse and infidelitie, as well as the cause of their ignorance, touching the resurrection, & their foolish doubt of the seuen brethren. Thus, notwithstãding ye Censurers iudgement, it is plaine, that the doctrine of this place hath aswel a general vse as a particular: & that Christ noted the fountaine of all ignorance, & not the ignorance of Sadducees touching resurrection alone.

Mat. 16.6.
Actes 5.7.

To your seconde point, that Christ spake not this to the people, but to ye learned Sadducees, first I answere, If the learned erre, not knowing the scriptures: the vnlearned are in more danger of errour through the same want. Secondly, if the want were not noted in all, the supplie shoulde not be made and commanded to all: but all, euen the people are commaunded to search the Scriptures, therefore not to search them, or to bee ignorant of them, is a fault in al, be they learned or vnlearned. Your argumẽt that Christ shoulde

Iohn 5.39.

speake onely to the Sadducees, and of the resurrection because it is added, you know not the power of God, is alreadie answered: for it is a generall fault, aswell to bee ignorant of the power of God, as not to knowe the Scriptures. Therefore as the ignorance of the one is condemned in all, so is the ignorance of the other, and the remedie for both is found in the exercise and search of the holy scriptures. Your similitude of woordes spoken as by my Lorde Chauncellor to the doctors of the Arches, is vnlearned, for with an example of speach concerning a speciall matter, you would ouerthrow that which was spoke by Christ, of a generall cause. But let your example stande: As the studie of the ciuill lawe is proper to all Lawyers: and therefore their lawe bookes to bee read and studied of all Lawyers: so the studie of the spirituall and heauenly Lawe, is the profession of all christians, and therefore the bookes of that law to be read and studied by all professors of the same, because to erre, not knowing the Scriptures, is a thing common to all men, as was declared. An example of the like had bene nothing for your purpose: as if my Lorde Chauncellor should say to some

Acts. 17. 11.

Iesuites,

Iesuites, Yee runne into daunger of treason, not knowing the Law against al those that withdrawe the Queenes subiects from their naturall obedience to her Maiestie: this should be a note not only to those Iesuites, but to al whatsoeuer they be, Iesuites, or Seminaries or massepriestes, or what persons soeuer, ꝑ they must eyther knowe and keepe the lawe, or incurre the punishment therein expressed agaynst the offenders. Vse good wordes of your countreymen: clowne them not, for though they bee simple, and not trayned in the studie of good letters, yet they haue soules to bee fed with the word: and (howsoeuer you mayse the Colliers sayth, and would put it in execution) they are to take heede they find not Christs word verefied against thē aswell as against ꝑ Sadducees. Ye erre, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God.

Hosius de aut. scrip. lib. 3. pag. 253. Iac. Noguer. de eccle. Christi lib. 1. pag 69. Mat. 22. 29.

In the eyght article the Iesuites are reported to say, That the righteous man liueth by sayth, he hath it not in Christ but by his owne workes. First in this question I am charged with untrueth, for the Iesuites haue no such thing, as the Censurer affirmeth. For answere in this behalfe, I

VIII

Cens Col. 118.

referre you to my authour, whose wordes being truely reported, the charge you laye vpon mee is causelesse, and must returne. But what is this, stil to denie the articles, to maynteine quarell: and yet to auowe the doctrine to defende the Iesuites? Your owne wordes teache that a mans workes are meritorious in Christ, and meanes to make him righteous with the seconde righteousnesse, as you call it: which is playnely to graunt the doctrine denyed before. For although you vsey name of Christ in this question, yet the Apostle cõcludeth, that you impute your saluation not to Christ, but to your owne workes. I testifie, sayeth the Apostle, (speaking of them that dyd not exclude Christ) that if yee bee circumcised, Christ doeth nothing profit you: teaching thereby, that whosoeuer will in any part bee righteous in them selues, can haue no righteousnesse in Iesus Christ. Therefore there was no cause of your impudent lyes.

Gal. 5. 2.

You come next to the place auouched for confutation of this errour: If righteousnesse come by our workes, it is not nowe grace. This sentence you truely conster as alledged by mee to proue that no

Rom. 11. 6.

mans

mans workes can bee rygheteous in this life: which you say is both from the purpose and false. But if the woordes be ful of proofe, to shewe there is no righteousnesse in mans woorkes, if it be the manifest doctrine of the Apostle, what coulde more fitly conuince the blasphemie, derogating from the righteousnesse which is by Christ, and arrogating to our owne workes, then that place which sheweth, there is no righteousnesse in our workes, but in Christ alone, which is imputed to vs by grace onely? Nowe let vs see how false it is. This you woulde proue by a distinction of a double righteousnesse, the first of being called from infidelitie to fayth in Christ, which you say is onely of Gods mercie, and not by any merit of our workes: the seconde righteousnesse is of such workes as proceede from men after the former calling, if they remayne in grace. But if this reede whereupon you leane, be broken, you must needes confesse the former proofe against you to be both pertinent and true. For this purpose it is to be considered, that as there was but one blessing shewed to Isaac, so there is but one onely righteousnes, which is not founde in any person or subiect, but

Gen.27.38. Heb.12.16. Act.4.12.

in our Sauiour Christ Iesus alone. This
1.Cor.1.30. Phil.3.9. righteousnesse is accounted and imputed
to all those that beleeue as their owne. In
which imputation it is needefull to consi-
der the proportion betweene ye redeemer, &
his redeemed, for it giueth great light to
this questiõ. As in Christ there was found
Iohn 19.4. 1.Cor.15.3. Rom.5.6. no cause of death at al, & yet hee died onely
by imputation of our sin: so in vs there is
found no cause of life at al, & yet we shal liue
onely by imputation of his righteousnes.
The like proportion is betweene the cou-
nant in the law and the couenant of faith in
Christ: for as ye law admitteth no transgres-
Psal.14.1. Rom.3.10. Gal.3.22. Deut.27. 26. Gal.3.10. Gal.5.3. sion, if a man will liue by it: so Christ ad-
mitteth no satisfaction or merit to ioyne vñ
his perfect merits, if any man will liue by
him: that ye whole worke of our saluation
may be of ye grace of God in Christ Iesus
Heb.12.2. the aucthour and fynisher of our fayth.
But to proue this righteousnesse one, there
is a place to the Romanes in the which
the righteousnesse wherby God saueth the
Rom.1.17. beleeuers, is called the righteousnes of
God: and said to be that which is reuealed
in the Gospell. This is the righteousnesse
of faith, as the Apostle proueth out of the
Gal.3.11. Habac.2.4. Prophet, witnessing that the righteous mã
liueth

liueth by faith which place proueth there is but one righteousnesse of men, not onely because the Apostle speaketh of it as one: but in naming it expressely the righteousnesse of God, and giuing to this faith both righteousnesse and life. For if the righteousnesse of faith, be the righteousnesse of God, that is, such as God accompteth for righteousnesse, which may also stand before him, and make vs holy in his sight, what second righteousnesse can there be, or what can it doe before God, that is not already accomplished by that first righteousnesse? Moreouer if this righteousnesse bee that which the Gospell teacheth, and not the Gospell only, but, as the same Apostle writeth afterward, which is testified by the law and the Prophets, whēce haue you brought vs a second righteousnesse, that neither the Lawe, nor the Prophets, nor the Gospell, haue reuealed vnto vs? The vanitie of this your deuise may further appeare, if we cōsider the iustice of God, which can not allowe for righteous any thing, but ꝑ which is absolutely perfect and holy in all respects, as the Lawe is most perfect & most holy. Wherefore both the satisfaction for our sinne committed, must be such as may

Rom. 3. 21.

Mat. 5. 19.
Iac. 2. 10.

fully

fully endure whatsoeuer the Lawe hath threatened for sin, and the obedience so exact and precise as it faile not in any poynt. But this righteousnesse is but one, and is in none but in our sauiour Christ (none other being able to make that ful satisfaction for sinne, nor perfectly to keepe the Lawe but he alone) therefore there can bee but one righteousnesse, which is in Christ Iesus, & accompted vnto those which beleeue in him according to the Gospell. The holy Apostles teach that after men be conuerted from infidelitie to faith, they stande righteous and liue in the sight of God, not by meanes of their woorkes, but by this faith wherebyt they beleeued. Abrahams example maketh this good, who after he was called from idolatrie to the seruice of God, is said to haue beleeued, and that his faith was reckoned to him for righteousnesse: not his woorkes first or last, least hee might haue wherein to reioyce and not in God. The Apostle to the Galathians, maketh this euident. We knowing, saith he, that a man is not iustified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Iesus Christ, we also haue beleeued in Iesus Christ, that we may bee iustified by the faith of Christ, and not by

Act.4.12. Matt.26.39. Heb.5.9.

Gen.15.6. Rom.4.3. Gal.3.6.

Gal.2.16.

workes

workes of the Law, because by the works of the Lawe no flesh shalbe iustified. In which words the Apostle plainely maketh saluation an effect of faith, and not of any workes, which we do after wee haue beleeued. Our sauiour Christ confirmeth this in diuers places, as in Joh: He that beleeueth in him that hath sent me, hath euerlasting life, & shal not come into condēnatiō, but is already passed from death to life: & He that beleeueth in the sonne, hath life euerlasting. An other place to the Galathians, maketh all this yet more manifest: where the Apostle speaking of himselfe long after his conuersion saith, That I nowe liue, I liue by the faith of him that loued me, and gaue him selfe for me. By these proofes it is euident, that there is but one onely righteousnesse, for which men are accompted righteous before him, which is the righteousnes of faith. To this may be added, that the only righteousnes of God is that, which giueth all the glorie of our saluation to God only in Christ Jesus, and shutteth out all vaunting and boasting of man: but the second righteousnes, which you imagine, doth not so, but leaueth somewhat for man to glory of: therefore it is no righteousnes

Ioh.5.24.

Idem.3.36.

Gal.2.20.

1.Cor.1.31.
2.Cor.10.17

Iere.9.23.
Rom.4.2.

taught

taught by the Apostle. Lastly, this also is a-
gainst your second righteousnes, that our
Esa.64.6. Luk.17.10. Phil.3.8. workes done by faith, yet are not perfect,
and therefore cannot make vs righteous
before God. These reasons may suffice in
this great question of our saluation, vrgently
to conuince the blasphemie of your deuise
inuented of Satan, to deceiue those that
seeking saluation more or lesse by their
Rom.10.3. owne workes, faile of that righteousnesse
which is by faith onely in GOD through
Christ Iesus our Lorde. Nowe seeing the
folly of this absurd distinction of a first and
of a second righteousnesse is euidently cõ-
uicted, it is also worthy of consideration
how this Censurer, that taketh vpon him
so iustly to deuide and giue euery thing his
owne, doeth here notwithstanding huddle
and confound righteousnesse with regene-
ration, and iustification with sanctification.
For that which hee calleth the second righ-
Eph.4.24. & 5.9. Gal.5.22. teousnesse, is that which the Scripture cal-
leth the New man, the fruits of the Spirit
or regeneratiõ. Furder also where he saith,
The first righteousnesse is of Gods mercie
only, and no way of our workes, or by any
merit of the same, it is to be noted that hee
is constrayned to acknowledge a righte-
ousnesse

ousnesse by faith onely, without any desert of workes: whereupon it should be obserued that the Censurer him selfe seemeth to be ashamed of ỳ merit of cõgruence, as the Schoolemen terme it, while he so flatly & fully affirmeth our calling to bee onely of Gods grace without any merit of ours.

Now to returne to his Censure againe, he addeth in the end a Censure vpon the allegation of the text vouched out of the Romanes, for the disproofe of the former blasphemous opinion. This he blameth as impertinent and vntrue: impertinent, because (in his construction) it is against the righteousnesse of good workes before our calling: and not generally against the righteousnesse of all good workes: wherein hee seemeth not to haue regarded the reason of the Apostle, which is taken from the nature of grace and workes so contrarie, that the one can neuer nor in any wise stande with the other. Therefore the argument is strong to proue that our saluation cannot be both deserued, and also freely giuẽ. Neither doth this argument holde in election onely, but whatsoeuer is of grace, as election, iustification, sanctification, glory, all these are in no sort, or part, of workes. Thus

Thom. Aq. prim. secun. quæst. 114. art. 2.

Rom. 11. 6.

the place is so forcible to the purpose it was alledged for, that the Censurer is not able to escape the sentence thereof. He complaineth lastly of wordes added, which are but to cleare the sense, and taken out of the second to the Galathians: where to like effect the Apostle saith, If righteousnesse be by the lawe, Christ dyed without cause. Gal.2.21. Thus, hauing satisfied all the Censurers pretensed doubtes, and conuicted him of errour, in the blasphemous doctrine of a second righteousnesse, I may worthely leaue the Iesuite to his voluntary Whip, for reformation of his iudgement: otherwise if he wil not learne to giue al the honour and causes of saluation to God in Christ, but will, in establishing his owne righteousnesse, abandon the righteousnesse of God by faith, which must stand altogether of it selfe, then in so teaching he wil drawe vpon him selfe other Whippes euen Scorpions whose sting abide for euer. For auoyding hereof I pray God (if it may make for his glory) that you Iesuites may receiue the loue of the trueth, & that you maye seeke & finde saluation in the merites of Christ alone to life euerlasting. Rom.10.3. Phil.3.9. Rom.3.22. 2.Thes.2.12.

IX The ninth report of Iesuites doctrine

is

is: Men doe surely hope that euerlasting life shalbe giuen them, but they doe not beleeue it: now hope often faileth, otherwise it were no hope. This article is confessed without any contradiction, that the wicked seruant may be iudged by his owne mouth. But the vouching of the places for contrarie doctrine, is censured for vnlearned huddling vp and confounding hope and faith as one thing: which note of the Censure, I may truely say, came from no deepe knowledge. A litle iudgement might haue serued your Censureship to discerne, that the two places were not alledged to proue or disproue any thing of faith (the full certeintie wherof is proued against you by the certeintie of hope) but to ouerthrowe that which the Iesuites say in the latter parte of the sentence, against which these places serue plainely and expressely. For what may more clearely proue against the Iesuites doctrine, that hope neuer faileth, then the Apostles wordes, calling it The ancre of the soule. Whereby he noteth our freedome from danger in all stormes of tentations, tidding out the time of this life without any peril or feare, and without any shipwrack touching our spirituall hauen.

Cons. Col. fol. 108.

Luk. 19. 22.

Heb. 6. 19.

uen. To shewe the force of this assurance, the Apostle vseth very significatiue wordes, calling it a sure and stable ancre: and yet to make it so full that no feare or doubt may remayne, he addeth that it entreth into the inwarde of the Vaile, whereunto Christ is entred, meaning thereby the heauens. Which importeth as much as if hee shoulde say, we that haue cast this Ancre aboue in heauen, are so much more safe, then they whose Ancre is cast downe into the Sea, as the holde wee haue taken in heauen by the Ancre of hope, is surer. Yea, the very Rockes shal sooner faile, thē our hold, settling vpon the strength & truth of gods
2. Cor. 1. 20. promise, which are al Yea & Amē in Christ Iesus. This our shoote Ancre of hope, hath taken holde of the mercy seate of God, and
Heb. 4. 16. of the throne of grace, which except some stormme be able to remoue, wee are in most ioyfull and stedfast safetie.

The like is promised by ye other place out of ye fifth to the Romanes: for, if hope ma-
Rom. 5. 5. keth not ashamed, and shame commeth when a man faileth of that he hopeth for: then hope can not faile. The Apostle maketh this more strong by that which followeth as a reason, The loue of God is abou-

dantly

daily shead out into our hearts by the holy Ghost which is giuē vnto vs. By which reason it appeareth, except the holy Ghost hath giuen vs a wrong testimonie of the loue of God, the hope which we haue conceiued thereby cannot deceiue vs. Thus you see these places so truely and fitly alledged, that al your falsely named learning will not be able truely to answere the allegacion of them, which notwithstanding it pleaseth you to call vnlearned. But let vs see what you call learning: forsooth the doctrine of Iesuites, touching the doubtfulnes and feare which is in hope, that is true, learned and cleare. This is (as the prophet complaineth) to call good bande, and sweete sawer: whereunto you know what belongeth. Esa. 5. 20.

For answere to these two places of hope, the Iesuites doctrine is declared at large, the effect of all standing in two pointes: the first concerning faith, the other of hope. Of faith they teach, that no man may beleeue that he in particular shalbe saued without a particular reuelatiō from God. A faithlesse doctrine of faith: and therefore not to bee lightly passed ouer. You seeme to proue it by reasons, one

drawen from ꝑ obiect of faith, which is the word written, or tradition, whereof neither as you say, doeth testifie mens saluation in particular: the seconde taken from the vncertaintie of the things beleeued: which (as the Censurer supposeth) doe depende vpon such conditions as possibly may not be performed. Both these great points, for want of scripture he setteth forth by examples, as minding rather to perswade them to prove. The first is of the answerer: the seconde of the possibilitie to be damned, as did fall out in Judas, and may fall out (a more fearefull case then I woulde put of him, had hee not put it of him selfe) in the Censurer him selfe. Nowe let vs consider, what great learning the Iesuites haue in this their opiniõ of faith, as the Censurer doth report them. To iudge, that without particular reuelation by name, no man can be sure of his saluation, is expressely against that the woorde of God teacheth in this great question. Therefore, howe learned soeuer the Iesuites make them selues, yet in deede as the Apostle speaketh of the wise Gentiles, they become starke fooles, not knowing true wisedome out of the woorde, but bastard wisedome by their foolish distinctions,

Mat. 27. 5.
Act. 1. 18.

1. Cor. 1. 20.

stinctions. The Censurers worde of Tradition must bee reserued for a fitter place. Touching the promise of the Gospell, it is general: whosoeuer beleeueth shall be saued: & the Censurer confesseth it. This generall promise hath place, and is certainely verefied in euery particular ꝑ beleeueth. Euery sensible mã without further learning may easely iudge in this doctrine: whatsoeuer is true in ꝑ general, must needes be true in euery particular. Nowe, if it be vndoubtedly true, that euery beleeuer shalbe saued, it must needes bee also, that Simeon and Lazarus beleeuing in Christ shalbe saued. Therefore what needeth any speciall reuelation in the worde, for that which is sufficiently comprehended vnder the generall? what neede is there by name to say from mã to man by name, Lazarus shalbe saued, & Titus shalbe saued, and Andrewe shall be saued, and so infinitely? Or shall we say that God in respect of persons doth particularly assure some of their certaine saluation, leauing all the rest to be tossed and caried vp and downe with feare and hope, as a ship in the sea caried hither and thither with contrary winds? Moreouer the very place cited by the Censurer as a particular reue-

Mar. 16. 16. Iohn 3. 16.

Luke 10. 20.

Lation, was not particular, but generall as all the disciples, that beleeued by vertue of a more generall couenant made to all that beleeue whatsoeuer. For, to examine that place neerer, all the disciples and all the Apostles, had not their names written in the booke of life: for Judas was excepted. And here by the waye, the Censurers ouersight must bee noted, that drawetb the place of Luke as speciall and particular to the Apostles, being spoken of the seuentie disciples. He wanted special knowledge herein, when hee so boldly made it an argument of the Apostles speciall reuelation.

John 13. 18.
Psal. 108. 8.

Luke 10. 17.

Of the most certayne and sure foundations of our particular fayth and hope, the Apostle writeth in the eight to the Romanes, saying that nothing was able to take from him the loue which God beareth to him in Christ Jesus, which hee setteth out by naming such things as are most like and mightie to strike a feare and doubt into his heart, as oppression, anguish, persecution, famine, nakednesse, and finally death it selfe: nay he addeth agayne, that neyther lyfe nor death, nor Angels, nor things present, nor thinges to come, nor height nor depth: that is, what so euer is in heauen aboue,

Rom. 8. 35.

loue, or in the earth beneath, or in the parts vnder the earth, finally that no creature is able to separate him from the loue of God, that is in Christ Iesus. But in maynte-nance of these errours you are wont to say, this was a speciall prerogatiue of the Apostle, which is easely taken away by that S. Peter writeth to this purpose: that the Saints had obtayned like precious fayth with him: which was true not in the degree, but in the kind and substance of faith: which should wholly differ, if the Apostles had a faith of their particular saluation, and we not. Agayne the certaintie of fayth appeareth by these reasons which the Apostle alleadgeth: Who shall indict the chosen of God? It is God that iustifieth, who shall condemne? It is Christ that hath died, nay rather who is rayse vp againe, who is also at the right hande of God, who maketh intercession for vs. These reasons of a most sure faith and hope that wauereth not, are of no particular reuelation, but of the generall doctrine of the Gospel, and of the common saluation, as Iude calleth it, which of right appertaineth to euery beleeuer, as wel as to Peter or to Paul.

2. Pet. 1. 1.

Rom. 8. 33.

Iam. 1. 6.

Iude. vers. 3.

The Censurers second reason is, that

the faithfull may fall away from the faith and from saluation: wherras the things beleeued remaine most certayne. The ground of this reason is to be denied, for it is most untrue, that any man who hath had faith, can euer afterward finally fall away. This may bee prooued by euident testimonies of the scripture, beside those alleadged aboue: as that which Christ teacheth of the beleeuer, in the eyght chapter of Iohn, He shall

Iohn 8.51. Idem 4.14. neuer see death: in the fourth, But the water that I shall gue him, shall be in him a spring of waters flowing vp to euerlasting

Iohn 10.29. life: in the tenth, The father is greater then all, and none is able to take them out of the fathers hands. Againe of the faithfull it is true, which the Apostle writeth, that

Rom.8. God hath iustified and glorified them. So certayne it is, as if it were already euery way perfourmed. But it were long to repeate any more. Notwithstanding there are places that mention a faith, which seemed for a time to be faithfull, but was not

Mar.11.13. as the fig tree was full of leaues, but without fruite. As for the examples of Iudas who hath faine, and of your selfe, who (your saye) may likewise cast your selfe away, if you list. I say of Iudas hee neuer be-

treued, because he was ꝑ childe of destruction. For my your selfe, if you haue bene alwaies of that minde you were of when you wrote this, you neuer had any true faith, and therefore coulde neuer yet fall awaye from it. What God may vouchsafe you hereafter I knowe not, but leaue it to his wisedome to dispose of his owne as it shal please him: but if euer he vouchsafe you this gift, I am sure the gates of hell shall neuer preuaile against you.

Psal. 108. 8.
Iohn 17. 12.
Act. 1. 18.
Matt. 16. 18.

Your seconde poyne is of hope, which in your doctrine hath two respectes, one of Gods mercie, and in that regard it is full of confidence: the other in respect of Gods iustice, which hath feare and doubt annexed with it. The places alledged before of hope, you expounde for the confidence thereof: which is true, if you stayed there, not adding other respects to roote out that which you woulde seeme to plant: for you shoulde haue made hope so firme and sure, that it can not be deceiued. But, as being of an other iudgement, you say that hope respecteth also the iustice of God, and the fearefull effectes of his seuritie, which you quote out of the Scriptures: concerning which effectes I will not dispute with you.

Mat.7.22. Onely in alleadging the last, I note your wantes, that without all regarde or any warrant of the text, dare say, that those reprobates shall come confidently in the last day hoping to be saued. For besides that it is impossible that their conscience can haue any sparke of confidence or hope of saluation, there is not any mention of such confident hope in the text, eyther expressly or by implication. If they had some hope, then also they must haue some faith, for they goe together hande in hande. Although I thus linke them together, yet I do not confound them: but acknowledge this differēce, that as faith is a full persuasion of the promise: so hope is a patient expectation and looking for, of the things which are beleeued. It is you therfore, that in deede huddle and confounde hope and a vaine persuasion as one thing: where as hope is no lesse sure then fayth, being grounded vpon the same foundation of the worde, and hath the same fulnes of persuasion. But this is ignorance and confusion, which who so discrieth, may well marueyle what cause you or your friendes finde to boast of your learning or order for disputation. Such cōfusion must be in Babell, which leauing with you: I

Gen.15.6. Rom.4.3. Galat.5.5. Tit.2.13.

Heb.6.11. 12. πληροφορία

saye further, that hope neuer respecteth Gods iustice, nor any thing else, but the things that are beleeued: which are ye most sweete and pretious promises of his life, kingdome, and glorie. Therfore what causes shoulde hope haue to feare? True it is that neither fayth nor hope is so perfect in vs, but that in these respects you name, we often feare: but this feare is no worke of hope, no more then doubt is a worke of fayth. For to say that hope feareth in some respects, is as much as to say, faith in some respectes doubteth and is no faith. We doe both doubt and feare, such are our infirmities: but that we doubt, it is not of fayth, but of vnbelieife: neyther doe we feare, as you speake of feare, by any effect of hope, but by the contrary worke of desperation. But after so many and sufficient reasons out of the worde to proue this question of importance, the wordes of the Censurer offer one not to be neglected. He affirmeth that hope in respect of the goodnesse of God is full of confidence and assurance. Therefore although he will needes against reason make confidence fearefull, yet shall he neuer cast any shadowe of feare vpon assurance, especially vpon a full assurance

Luk.12.32. Heb.6.12. Item.11.11.

Lam.1.6,7,8 Mar.19.24. 24.

such

1.Pet.1.17. Phil.2.12. such as he confesseth. Nowe for the places you alleadge, they concerne not this feare nowe in question, but expresse a godly care to liue woorthie our calling, which is not against the confidence of hope, but a remedie agaynst presumption and securitie. Eccles.9.3. The place which you alleadge out of the preacher, sheweth you to be a great clarke, able to reade and cite a place, though you come not neere the matter by many degrees. The wise man there disputeth of that a man may gather by prosperitie and aduersitie, and not what he knoweth by the worde of God. For neyther can aduersitie nor prosperitie shewe the loue or hatred of God toward vs: it was the deceitfull counsell of Iobs frendes, to drawe him into these argumentes of Gods purpose. But Iob by fayth coulde confesse agaynst all calamities and extremities, saying, though Iob.13.15. he kill mee, yet will I beleeue in him still. Thus the learned diuinitie of the Iesuites, may appeare to them that will beholde it. Howe dyd you forgette the two millstones you are wont to alledge for teachers in this matter. When a man you saye, doeth beholde that he standeth vpon, it maketh him holde: but looking vnto that ouer his head

he

he is in feare. Wo be vnto them that teach such offensiue and erroneous doctrines, deceitfully confirming them with similitudes and distinctions so farre from the truth, and yet easie to be imbraced, and deceiue the ignorant. It were better for them that a millstone were hanged about their necke, & they throwne into the bottome of the sea, then thus to infeeble the faith and hope of Gods children, by their faithles and fearefull doctrines. Yet the Censurer and his fellowes (if you will beleeue him) reconcile all Scriptures together, mayntey-ning confidence and feare in Christian hope, whereas we are sayde to confounde and huddle vp matters; but hereto I answere, let him that offendeth herein, bee both offended with himselfe, and not reconciled to God, till he repent.

In the tenth article the Iesuites are reportedde sayde, The Scripture in deede neuer teacheth the inuocation of Saintes; yet we must beleeue, receyue and holde it. Here youe Censure both the alleadging of the Iesuites opinion, and the text auouched to disproue the same. You sayde it is false that they graine, the inuocation of Saintes is no where taught in the Scriptures.

x

Cens. Col. 369. 70. 71.

tures. Neuertheleſſe you graunt afterwarde that Monhemius charging them ſo, and therfore gathering that it ought not to be beleeued, they make this anſwere, p many things are to be beleeued, which are not expreſſely ſet downe in the Scripture. To which purpoſe you your ſelfe adde afterwarde, that the inuocation of Saintes is deduced out of many and euident places of Scripture: whereby it appeareth, that you all confeſſe, that the Scriptures expreſſely teach it not. Howe, that praying to Saintes is by neceſſary conſequence to be gathered out of many euident places of the Scriptures, and to be proued by generall Councils, Fathers, and the vniuerſall practiſe of all Chriſtendome from the beginning, though you boldly affirme it, yet you bouch not any one place of ſcripture, nor any one proofe of ſo many. If you haue ſo good bookes to ſhewe, it ſtandeth vpon your credit to bryng them to lyght. For whereas your idolatrous praying to ſaints is deteſtable in euery ſort, both for the ſinne itſelfe, and becauſe you commende it without any likely colour of excuſe: if you bee not able to anſwere to ſo grieuous a crime, as you are charged with herein, (being in

Rom. 10, 14.

deede high treason against the heauenly Maiestie of the eternall God) yet you may alledge somewhat by waye of excuse, to finde some fauour, if so great authoritie, as you pretende, haue carryed you awaye like simple people to ryse vp and rebell agaynst the Lorde. You sende vs to your Catholike bookes touching this question, which we haue seene and read, but fynde not any warrant, which may iustifie your doctrine.

Hauing boasted of much & perfourmed nothing, in your second Censure, of ỳ place alledged agaynst Saintes inuocation, you blame me for auouching but that one text of scripture for the disproofe: yet your selfe haue brought none for your necessary defence. To ouerthowe the place, you bring two answeres, but tel vs to which of them you will stand. The first is grounded in Limbo patrum, that is to say, hath no grounde at al, as there was neuer any such Limbus, but framed & setled in your imagination. The seconde, which you seeme to relie more vpon, is in effect this assertion: not to knowe is not to allowe. This if I might graunt you, it doeth not take away the force of the place. But

of ꝑ which, allowing you your owne sense, I reason thus: Because GOD onely is here declared to be of fatherly loue toward
Isa.63.16. vs, who also is readie to pardon vs, when Abraham by your sense, would not knowe vs but condemne vs: therefore it is both wisedome and duetie to praie to God, and the contrary both vanitie & sinne. But because you require other reasons and places for this purpose, take these of a number. It is not lawfull to giue the worship of God to any other, according as it is written.
Deut.6.13. & 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God & him only shalt thou serue. I wil not giue my
Mat.4.10. Esa.42.8. glory to any other, nor my praise to idols.
Iohn 16, 24. But prayer is a speciall honor and seruice that God requireth of vs, as it is said in the
Psal.50.16. fifteeth Psalme. Call vpon me in the day of trouble, and I wil deliuer thee, and thou shalt glorifie me. Whatsoeuer you shall
Iohn 15.15. aske the father in my name, he will graunt it vnto you. Againe, a man cannot praye to any but to those in whom he doth beleeue. Rom.10. How shall they call vpon him in
Rom.10.14. whom they haue not beleeued? But it is not lawfull to beleeue in any but in God alone: which is proued by the former places, faith being a principall part of Gods

seruice:

seruice: Therefore it is not lawfull to pray to saintes or to any creature whatsoeuer. I might here shewe all promises made to prayer: all precepts and examples of prayer in all the whole bodie of the Scriptures to be onely of prayer to God: and no one precept, promise, or approued example of prayer to any saint liuing or dead, or to any other creature. But this place being cleare and mightie against you: I will conclude with the Prophet Ionas, They which obserue lying vanities, let them forsake the goodnes shewed vnto them: but with the voyce of thankesgiuing will I sacrifice vnto the Lorde, I will pay that which I haue vowed, all maner of saluation is of the Lorde.

Ionah. 2. 8.

In the eleuenth the Iesuites are charged to teach that Christ neuer sayd to the lay men, Doe this in remembrance of mee. Seeing you pretend, that notwithstanding you expound Do this, of the Ministers only, yet you meane not so, but that the people are also commaunded to communicate at the Lordes Supper as well as they, I can the more easely leaue you to followe your owne sense: for the doctrine against lay mens consecration or ministration, is not

XI

Cens. Col. fol. 302.

not in controuersie, but it is (except you faile) holden on both, that none but called Ministers should minister the sacraments. But if, as you haue alreadie committed the greatest sacriledge and churchrobbery that may bee in taking away from the people the Cup of the newe Testament, and the Communion of the pretious bloud of our Sauiour Christ: so nowe by this exposition, you would leaue the people at libertie, to chuse whether they will be partakers of this bodie too, or no, ẏ you may driue them altogether from the table of the Lorde, the sacriledge shalbe so made the more intollerable. If the Commaundement, Doe this in remembrance of me, binde not the people to come to the Lords table, howe shall the other wordes, Take ye, Eate ye, bynde them? What moued you here to cite your Clement, Ambrose, & Cyprian with others I knowe not, except it were some merimente, to ioyne with your similitude of singing: for in good earnest you minde not by those places without matter in them, to proue that the wordes of Christ, Doe this in remembrance of me, were onely saide to the Ministers touching Consecration, and not to the people also for their participation.

Luke 22.20.
1.Cor.10.16.

Luke 22.19.
1.Cor.11.24

gation.

In the twelfth Article the Iesuites are reproued to say, Traditions are of equall authoritie with the worde of God: wee must beleeue them though they bee manifestly against the Scripture. Here the reporte and the texte vouched to disproue their doctrine are both censured. The first for adding, we must beleeue them, though they be manifestly against the Scripture, & for reporting the rest so generally and confusedly. Touching ye latter point, if my report of your doctrine be in these wordes: Traditions are of equall authoritie with the worde of God, meaning it of some only (for who would thinke it of all, you hauing so many and so feeble?) why doe you charge mee, as generally and confusedly saying, al traditions are equal with ye scriptures? Was it I may you, to deserue your owne note of a founde lye for a parting blowe? which false misreport you haue doubled to make it the founder. For an answere to the former poynt, I doe not onely auow that I haue faythfully reported my authors wordes (which is always my iust defence against your vniust slander laying them vpon me) but I say further, that their

Cens. Col. fol. 2 30.

practise compared with their wordes will iustifie the report as truely layde downe against them. For proofe whereof not to goe further, the Censurer rehearseth amongest these traditions, which the Popish Church charge our faith withall, the number of the bookes of Scripture, & the Lent fast. Of al other traditions these two are taken out to stande for their owne credit and for the credit of the rest: let vs therefore see what treasons there are against God in these your traditions. First the Apocrypha bookes are not in the ancient Canon or language of Canaan: the fathers haue disauowed them, they are euidently repugnant to the doctrine of the holy scriptures, and disagreeing among themselues. Yet your Trent conspiracie doeth adde them to the number of the Canonical bookes, and holde all men accursed, that holde them not for canonicall scriptures. Therefore this your tradition is manifestly against the word of God. Further also, what is more manifest against the woorde of God then the doctrine of deuils? The Lent fast, as you commaunde to keepe it, for conscience sake, forbidding meates created of God to bee taken with thankesgiuing,

Eusl. lib. 3. cap. 3. ver. 1. & 5. ver. vlt. & lib. 4. cap. 1. ver. 2.
Tob. 12. 15.
Iudit. cap. 9.
2. Mac. 2. & 14. 4.
Concil. Trident sess. 4. decret. de Canõ. script.

1. Tim. 4. 1.

uing, is plainly called a doctrine of deuils. Furthermore your opinion is playnely deliuered to be with this distinction: Ecclesiasticall traditions are of no greater authoritie then the writings and other decrees of the Church: and Apostles traditions are of no lesse authoritie then if they had bene written by them, or then are the other thinges which they wrote. This is confusedly taught and needeth yet more plainenesse: for not all orders deliuered by the Apostles, are to bee kept perpetually and vnchangeably, of like authoritie with the doctrine of the Gospell, which they preached. The Apostolique doctrine is perpetuall, subiect to no varietie of persons, of times or places: but some traditiõs, that is, some orders are altered, as that in the acts, where they commaunde to abstaine from strangled and from blood: for it appeareth that the Apostles commanded not this for a perpetuall order, alwayes inuiolably to be obserued, but onely for a time to auoide offences: which cause ceasing, the order or tradition was no longer in force. Againe, some orders might be set downe by them for comlinesse, which yet were not to be beleeued as necessary partes of saluation, nor

Act. 15. 29.

72690

yet to remayne for euer in that forme or kynde: and therefore can not be matched with the Apostolique doctrine of fayth, which is euer al one, and which whosoeuer
1.Pet.4.17. beleeueth not, cannot bee saued. Nowe touching your pretensed Apostolicall traditions, I vtterly denie that there are any such, besides those which are euidently shewed, or by iust consequence fitly gathered out of the written worde. For what so euer
Luke 16.29. Eph.2.20. 2.Tim.3.15. is necessary to saluation, is in this sort to be proued by the holy Scriptures. Therefore your Censureship dyd well to adde, If they be certaynly descended from Christ and his Apostles. But how can this I pray you be certaynely knowen, but by the holy writings? can any other custome or testimonie assure your consciences what came undoubtedly from Christ, or what from his Apostles? Is there any one of your traditions that you can vouch to descend from so sufficient authors, otherwise then by report of insufficient witnesses? What is it then for you to boast of inuincible arguments to proue diuers doctrines not written, but left by woorde of mouth onely, whereas you bryng nothing but counterfeyt Councils, erring Fathers, fabulous

stories,

stories, and Apocrypha scriptures. This is right the bragging Apostle, and a shewe of the baine chalenger. Yf a man coulde be feared with the guilee of your armour, or with your plume of feathers, you woulde bee a worthie champion, wounding more with a vayne feare; then with the force of your shinking arme. In this encounter of al your proofes, you have sorted out two: the first is out of that excellent chapter to the Thessalonians, concerning a prophecie and revelation of Antichrist. For an answere to which place it is first to be vnderstoode, that the worde Tradition in the Apostles speach, commeth as it doth in Latin, of a verbe to deliver, so that whatsoever ye Apostle deliuered to the Churches, those were the traditions hee leste with them. Therefore I denie that Paule doth in any place by tradition signifie any vnwritten veritie, but that as in other places, he vnderstandeth the doctrine of the Gospel, which in the sundrye partes thereof he deliuered. This appeareth apparauntly by the place so cited for your purpose, without regarde of any more then the worde Tradition. For in the verses nexte before, the Apostle maketh mention of the Thessalonians faith to

2. Thes. 2. 15.

2.Thes.2. 13.14. the trueth, saying, God hath called you thereunto by our Gospell, to obtayne the glory of our Lorde Jesus Christ: and therupon inferreth this conclusion: now therefore brethren stand fast, & holde the tradition which you haue learned, eyther by worde or by our epistle. Whereby it plainly appeareth, that the traditions or thinges deliuered by him, partly by word, and partly by writing, were the diuers partes of the Gospell which hee had taught them. Wherefore the written woorde affordeth you no proofe for vnwritten verities. The seconde is of doctrines, which you say, wee holde not by record of writing, but by word of mouth from Christ and his Apostles: as for example, baptisme of infants, celebratiõ of Sunday, ẏ number of ẏ bookes of scripture, & the fast of Lent. If this be not hudling and confounding of things together of vnlike sort, I knowe not what may be called confusion. For what order is it (to repeate vpõ the Censurers occasion ẏ which was noted in the fourth article) to match the baptisme of children with the fast of Lent? The one being by plaine argument gathered out of the worde, as namely out of the wordes of the couenant, I will bee

thy

thy God and the God of thy seede, and thy children after thee for euer. This couenaunt doth appertayne to both a like, to Abraham and his seede: whereunto the seale and practise was adioyned in circuncising infantes of eyght dayes, as well as Abraham of great age, and that by expresse commaundement of God. Thus the doctrine is so prooued out of the written worde, as that no doubt remayneth. Nowe circumcision was the sacrament or seale of that righteousnesse which is by fayth, as Saint Paul teacheth: wherein it is equall to our baptisme. But this is your great learning, when you are not able for your ignorance, to prooue a doctrine out of the written worde, to say, we haue it by tradition and by worde of mouth from the Apostles. Now your Lent fast as you vse it, hath not onely no ground out of the worde, but is agaynst the worde as I prooued before. If this bee your methode and discretion, I maruell not if good order be hurdling and confounding in your accompt. For the number of the bookes, and for the Lordes day, I myght likewise make proofe out of the worde: so that if you can bring vs nothing by worde of mouth from the Apo-

Gen.17.7.

Ibidem.17.10.

Rom.4.11.

ties, but your Lent fast, your letters of credence will not serue you to be beleeued.

The seconde Censure is that the place alleadged by me to confute the authoritie of traditions, should be impertinent. This the Censurer woulde shewe by three differences betweene it and this purpose. First, of the diuers cause of those traditions, which our Sauiour Christ inueyeth against, whereof they had beene authors to themselues, and of these which he affirmeth to descende from Christ and his Apostles. But as in deede the difference woulde be great if this were true, so being false and untrue as it is, it can make no difference at all. Theirs were in deede such as they affirme, and though you deny it, so are yours also. For which of all your traditions came eyther frõ Christ or from his Apostles? wh̃ you proue them frõ either of them, your difference shall be allowed. Secondly, you say Christ reprehendeth not al obseruation of mẽs traditiõs, but the naughtie obseruing of thẽ: which was, as you affirme, in that ꝑ Pharises esteemed them more then Gods word, & brake it for the keeping of them, which you condemne. This also, if it were true, were a sufficient difference: but it is

untrue

untrue that our Sauiour Christ reproued onely the esteeming of them more then Gods commaundementes. It can not bee denied, but he reprooued this in them in the same chapter before: but in the woordes alleadged, You worshippe mee in vaine, teaching doctrines that are but traditions of men, (which are no woordes of comparison) our Sauiour simplie rebuketh them for esteeming the keeping of mens traditions to be any seruice of GOD: to which rude the sentence had bene first vttered by the Prophet. The thirde note is double, first that these traditions were idle & foolish: of which sore are yours, and whatsoeuer the idle brayne of man deuiseth to serue God withall: the second that some of them were impious, direct contrary to the word of God, such as were certayne corrupt expositions of the lawe: where you are as like to them, as the sonne may be to the father. For neuer were there more false glosses vpon the word of God violently thrust, and by litle and litle secretly conueyed into the Church, peruerting the true meaning of the Scriptures, and corrupting the simple worshippe of GOD, then haue beene brought in by your Rabbines, that haue

Matt.15.9. Mat.7.7.

Esay.29.13.

obtay-

obtayned the highest seates, and the most honourable names, more then euer did any among the Iewes. You speake of the Talmud as dyd bastarde Denis of the orders in heauen: but this floriſh of your skill in those bookes because it hurteth not the cause, let it serue you and your frendes, for as much credit as it may.

XIII. Lastly the Iesuites are reported to teach that we must worship ỳ image of Christ, with like honour that wee doe the holy bookes of the Gospell. In this article the doctrine is graunted without any word of contradiction: your Censure onely toucheth the second to the Corinthes the first chapter, as not alledged to the purpose. In deede if you list not to vnderstand to what end it is vouched, you may well complaine against the alledging thereof as from the matter. You take it as brought to proue, that we may worship the image of Christ with greater honour, then the bookes of the Gospell: but you mistake the matter, and wilfully (as it shoulde seeme) to haue some what against the cause. For how could you think, that he which detesteth al idols, would alledge a place to prooue that the image of Christ is worthy honour more then

Cens. Col. 66.

2. Cor. 6. 15.

then Gospels: Or howe may not any man note you of open contradiction against the word of God, that being deuoutly madde vpon idols, would for their loue prophane the temple of God; and therefore dare to say there is more agreemẽt betweene them (which yet the Apostle maketh most contrarie) then there is betweene the place of Saint Paul, & the matter which the same place doth fitly disproue? But if you list to vnderstand, the place seruetb to proue that no image at all is to be worshipped, for which the wordes are so pertinent and so strong, as all the wisedome of your Censureship and of the rest, will neuer bee able to answere them. Therefore you lost your labour in framing arguments, to proue why the material booke of Gospels should be no lesse worshipped then the image of Christ: for neither of both are to bee worshipped, nor any other creatures whatsoeuer, according to that which was before alledged to this purpose: Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serue. You can not escape, for saying you giue no diuine honour vnto them, for this bowing downe before them (which is one of the least deuotions you vse) is challenged

Mat. 4. 10. Exod. 10. 5.

longed as diuine honour, and expressely forbidden in any respect of religion or deuotion to images, or any other creature, as hath beene often declared. But here saying the honour done to the image of Christ and to the letter of the Bible is not done to them selues, you dissemble your owne idolatrous doctrine, which alloweth the same honour to the image, that is due to the paterne, and namely the same most honourable and diuine worship of Latria to the Crucifix, which is due to the Lord Iesus Christ himself. Your bookes that teach this, are many and not vnknowen. So in other questiõs it appeareth that either you are ashamed of your owne doctrine, or els you will not defende it in such sort as you teach it, least the vantage should be euen in your own opinion, too open and too great against you. Also it commeth to bee noted howe you huddle the karuer of an image that is cursed, with a printer: and an image that is an abhomination, with the holy Bible: as if it were all one to make an image of God, and print the worde of God. Secondly (being herein cõtrarie to your self,) you vndertake to proue that creatures may be worshipped, and, as if the matter were

Exod. 20. 5. Leuit. 26. 1. Deut. 11. 16.

Paiua: lib. 9. orthodox. expl. pag. 705. Saunders de typ. honore et adorat. imag.

out

out of doubt, you demand what we will say to the worship done vnto the Arke, vnto the Cherubins, vnto the Serpent of brasse. For some shewe of proofe you alledge the fiue & twentieth of Exodus, & the 45. Psal. mistaken by you for the 99. In the place of Exodus there is no woorde leading vs to worshippe, but onely a commandement of making the Arke, and the Cherubin of such fashion as is there prescribed. If were condemned all vse of graueing or painting, this myghe haue serued your turne: but speaking only against your worshipping of creatures, it maketh nothing against vs, or to iustifie your idolatrie. The place of Dauid doth not shewe what we must worship, but where we must worshippe, euen at the footestoole of the Lorde with all humilitie, being there prostrate vpon the ground, and humbled before him. The other two places of Numb. the 21. and Iohn 3. are brought by you to proue the worshippe of the brasen serpent. In which places there is no such matter, but a commandement as before, to make it & set it vpon a perch, that it might bee the better seene: with a promise that they which had beene stung with fiery serpentes, if they looked vpon the brasen serpent

Exod. 25. 20.
Psal. 99. 5.

Num. 21. 9.
Iohn. 3. 14.

pent, should receiue their health. Now, except to looke vpon a thing be to worship it, here is no place at all to proone that you saye. If you had cited the place out of the kinges, there is a cleare testimonie, that the brasen Serpent was worshipped: but it made not for your purpose, seeing good Ezechias in the same place did therefore breake it downe because it was worshipped. Thus you may see what we haue to say out of the worde against your false suggestions, and against your mistaking and misconstruing the Scriptures. But this place and that of Iohn were answered in the first Article. The second to the Philippians sheweth a great iudgement and skill in you: it is there written thus of Christ: God hath exalted him, and giuen him a name which is aboue euery name, that at the name of Iesus euery knee should bow, of things in heauen, of things on the earth, and things vnder the earth. Hereupon you gather, first that the name of Iesus is to be worshipped, so as at the hearing of it, we should bow our knees. Now, if this bowing be due to ꝑ sound of a name, which is but a creature, then in your iudgement some creature is to bee worshipped:

3.Kin.18.4.

Phil.2.9,10.

and

and so consequently such as your Censure-ship shall appoint. But as when you spake of the Cherubines, you were not vnder the winges of ye Cherubines: nor being before ye Arke, receiued any Oracle: so now though you speake of the Lorde Iesus, exalted to the righte hand of his Father, yet you are neuer a whit neerer drawen vnto him, nor vnderstand what his glorie meaneth. The name of Iesus is here no creature to feede the eare, as an image feedeth the eye (which is your distinction borowed with the rest out of Lindane) but it signifieth the soueraigne power and authoritie which Christ hath receiued ouer all creatures both in heauen and in earth, as appeareth in the same place, where it is saide that God hath giuen him a name aboue euery name: and in the eleuenth where hee speaketh of confessing Iesus Christ to be the Lorde. The bowing of the knee, is not that which these words in their proper signification declare: for how should it agree to Angels and other creatures, which haue no knees as men haue: but obedience and subiection is figuratiuely noted by this outward signe of obedience vsed among men. The meaning therefore of the Apostle is to shewe

Lind. de fug. idol. pag. 121

Mat. 28. 18. Iohn 17. 2.

Phil. 9. 10. 11.

that

that our Sauiour Christ, when he had humbled, and as it were emptied him selfe for our sakes, and became as nothing, that was all, was afterward exalted euen as hee was man aboue all creatures, hauing soueraigne power and authoritie giuen him ouer all, so that all creatures are made subiect to his commaundement. This being the meaning of the Apostle (that I may not returne home your wilfull and malitious termes) I leaue to shewe what good grace you had in alleadging this text for your purpose. But, the Lord reforme it, thus you are constrained ignorantly, or wilfully to straine and constraine the holy Scriptures, when you haue once set down a resolution to maintaine errour. Neuertheleſſe as I noted, the Scripture is not commaunded or made to serue for euery frame, as a leaden rule: it is not pliable to serue euery purpose, as a nose of waxe, but freeth it selfe from all iniuries, and continueth the same course to condemne all errour, and iustifie the trueth for euer. As for Austens place, your notes deceiued you, for he is farre from allowing idol or image worship: neyther can you finde any such speache to maintaine your idolatrie as

Aug. lib. 3. de Trin. cap. 9. & 10.

is

is alleaged. Austen hath some such words as you alleadge, but in an other booke and to another purpose: for after a disputation against images and idols, hee speaketh of the signes and sacraments of the Church, which represent the Lord vnto vs, not as images, but as signes & seales ordeined of God to informe & strengthē our vnderstanding in ꝑ faith. Further you giue a Censure vpon this, that I call the image of Christ an Idol. I knowe in it selfe it is a creature, and an idol is nothing in the worlde: but as the image imagined of God is an idol, and the worshippers thereof idolaters, which is prooued by the first to the Romanes, so the Image of Christ worshipped by you is an idol of yours, and you are idolaters for worshipping of it. As for the curse of Laue Irenes Councill wherewith you theaten me, because it fleeth away like a birde, I feare it not. But I heartily wish you to feare his curse, who hath theatned idolaters vnto that lake, that burneth as you know, frō which your quilet of Image and Idol, & of Dulia worship & Latria worship wil not be able to deliuer you, but a true repentance onely, & conuersion from the worshippe of idols to the seruice of the true and

Aug. lib. 3. de doctr. christia. cap. 8. & 9.

1. Cor. 8. 4.

Rom. 1. 23.

Concil. Nicon. 1. Pro. 6. 2.

Apoc. 21. 8.

1. Thess. 1. 9.

liuing God, which (notwithstanding all your tauntes and want of your promised Christian charitie) the Lorde vouchsafe to worke in you by his powerfull worde and mightie spirit. I can not altogether content my selfe, thus to haue fully answered the chiefe matter of this article, but, you drawing me on with your tauntes, I must answere to them also. For the difference of an Image and an Idol you knowe my answere, and I acknowledge not your difference. Touching your honours done to the creature and creator, I doe not maliciously confound them: but you do vnlearnedly make a distinction in wordes, when in deede there is none. When wee teach ẏ al your worshippes are idolatrous, we offer you no wrong, neither do we therin blind our hearers, or charge you with doctrines which are not your own. For if any worship be greater then other, that you giue to the crosse and image of Christ: & you can not denie this, being your playne doctrine, (as I haue declared) by Thomas, by Saunders, & by Andradius so expressed, as we can not more expresse it against you. Therefore we doe not mainteine matter of rayling against the true Catholike Church, which hath

Thom. Aquin. tert. parte summæ. quæst. 25. Saunderus de typic. hon. et ador. imag. Payua orthodox. expl. lib. 9. pag. 706.

hath alwayes more detested all Idolatrie, then your Church doeth or can defende it. For your repeated words, God forgiue you I must conster them in the best part: but comming in the middest of other scoffes, they giue me occasion to note, that many offend in the vttering of them against God, whose name they take in vaine, and against their neighbour, whome they curse and cane with wordes that import a charitable prayer: which is to be reformed in our speach, least such sinnefull vse of good wordes, increase the note of euill maners.

Exod. 20.4.
1. Iohn 5.21.

All these XIII articles are graunted, yet your Censureshippe doeth couer the graunt most carefully, as one that knowes well what shame it is, playnely and openly to graunt so foule absurdities. You might haue prouided better for your owne credit, and agaynst mine, if you had directly denied but one of them, to proue at the least one slaunderous false report: for this alone woulde haue preuailed more against mee, then all your naked vauntes and vndeserued sentences of disgrace. But no one being denyed, what cause had you as fearing no examination of your booke, and without all regarde of trueth to saye: Thus I

 haue

haue answered briefely your slaunderous false reportes of the Iesuites doctrine? In place of an answerer you haue only shewed your selfe a cauiller, & passing by the matter, you haue propounded to your selfe newe propositions from the purpose, such as you might more easily confute thē those wherewith you are charged. Therefore it appeareth, notwithstanding your Censure, that I haue with seemely and fitte wordes charged the Iesuites, that they teach blasphemies against God and his worde, that they are the Popes proctors in that seruice, and bewraye the spirit of Antichrist. Let the record of your false sentence, charging mee with a lying spirit of Antichrist, with an ignorant and rayling spirit, remayne with the placing of your name for mine, til you haue otherwise proued, that my speaches against the vncleane doctrine and rebellious practises of your Iesuites, are vntrue or rayling. And because so cleare places in the worde of God, with the interpretation of the name and nomber of 666. agreed of by auncient fathers, and founde to accorde with the Latin and Hebrewe wordes, doe make Antichrist to sit at Rome, in the citie buylded vpon seuen hilles, if they make it

2.The.2.3.4.
Iren.lib.5. cap.20.5.
Aretas Andreas apud Aretā pag. 955.956.

Apoc.13.18.

to

to be a Latin and Romiſh Church, let ꝓ record ſtande agaynſt the Pope ꝓ he is Antichriſt, and againſt al other his inſtrumentes, for that they haue the ſpirite of Antichriſt full of all corruption. Wheras you charge me that my zeale ouerranne my witte, in reporting the former doctrines as blaſphemous, it is to ſpeake without proofe, and to ſlaunder without controlement. For I muſt agayne ſaye, that all your ignorante euill zeale, and al your witte knoweth not howe to denye any one of theſe xiii. articles, except you will willingly & wittingly runne into a curſe of the Trent Councill. Therefore your bitter taunt was without cauſe in reſpect hereof, as alſo in reſpect of that ꝓ followeth about a maſſe booke. For in my conſcience I am not priuie, ꝓ I did at any time crye out, or at all beter theſe wordes. A blaſphemie, findyng the bleſſed virgin named mother of God. Wherefore vntil you bring better proofe of it, my religious veniall ſhal more then weigh downe your hateful affirmation, & conuince you of breaking ꝓ nienth cõmandemẽt, by rayſing ſuch infamous reproches in print agaynſt your neighbour, eyther vpon light report of an enemie, or vpon your owne imagina-

tion. I am not in this sort ouergreedie of your discredit, to whom in that generall loue I owe to all men, I wish in the Lorde the riches and honour of true godlinesse,
2. Thes. 2. 10. praying that you may receiue the loue of the trueth, and bee blessed as I woulde bee blessed. But this your cause of teaching errour, and labouring to roode out the gospell, must more and more bee brought into discredit, eyther to drawe you to a loue of ꝑ trueth, or to make you ashamed of such lies. If I did in deede any way hurt my cause, you loue it not so well as to admonish mee thereof: but I trust, ꝑ Lord would prouide me more faythful remẽbrancers. For your next wordes of reproche, that wee seeme to haue made a compact betweene vs euery man to lye his part, howe vntrue are they, and howe full of reproch? To lye is a fowle sinne: but to lye with consent and conspiracie that the lye may haue the more force and greater credit, it is double iniquitie, and furder from vs by the grace of God, then from any of you. If the force of trueth ouerbeare you not, without Gods extraordinary iudgemẽt, I looke not to see you ouerborne. This thirtieth leafe of your booke will afford a scantlin of your

bro-

brotherly loue, if any man will take the measure. Notwithstanding in the ende you please mee so well, that I must thanke you for your helping hande in a good worke. And although you tell the tale so, that I may seeme to haue a fellowshippe in the offence, yet bring free, I subscribe to your good aduertisement against imprinting lying newes, as that from Rome. For it is so great a sinne, to imprint lyes and rumors for filthy lucre, and euery where to empty mens purses and fill their heades with fables, that for such an iniquitie, euery such Printer deseruetb to carye a print of his vngodly couetousnesse, and dishonour offered to thachis so excellent and so profitable arte. Touching the purpose of him, that to perswade the allowance, was like to affirme the matter true, if he were a Papist, such as is most like to tell what is done at Rome, hat had a wretched mind to sinne himselfe of purpose, that he might laye it vpon the innocent: If it were, as you presume, one that would so disgrace ꝑ Pope, (which cannot be gathered by any word in all the copie) it was in him a greater sinne. For without lying newes, there is true matter enough against the Pope and a-

gainst Rome. But if a former copie imprinted at Strasbrough gaue it credit here, it was a lesse offence, yet a great ouersight. Now what vantage doe you take by that payne and lying Pamphlet? will you haue all the faithfull charged with the fault of one or two Printers? and for a fault so ordinary in all other like cities? your margin all notes are like the wordes of a craftie seller, ý promiseth more then the buyer can find. For your margēt in a disgrasing note, promiseth to lay open lying for the game: and you haue chosen two places to proue it against me, For the first of Cardinall Pooles purpose, to reforme some grosse things at Popery, and Steuen Gardiners answere, I appeale to many which are witnesses to me of this knowen and vnqoubted reporte. To proue the second lye, you doe openlye peruert and falsifie my plaine wordes and meaning. For in my answere I say, Papists yeelde in nothing, and proue it to be so. Neuertheles, I gaue a note that our bastarde Papists in Englande neyther true to vs, nor faithfull to their owne side, (as since, Howlets authour complayneth) woulde seeme to be ashamed of images, pardons, prayers to Saints, and seruice in

an

an vnknowen tongue: saying they verily hold thē as wicked things: Which I spake to note their hypocrisie, But you, to shew a lie for the game, lay downe my words as if I had not said they would seeme ashamed but as if I had directly affirmed that they confesse the same thinges to bee wicked. Which if I had said of some, it had beene no lye: but I spake onely of their dissimulation. Therefore what is it for you to say, our resolution appeareth, which we haue made to auouch any thing, bee it neuer so false, to blushe at nothing bee it neuer so shamefull, and to inuent whatsoeuer may serue for your purpose to entertaine and delude the people? In this short conclusion without all cause, you haue crowded vp together many great wordes of reproche, against the greatest, and against the least of them that loue the Gospell. But I haue proued, who they bee that delude the people with such lies and inuenting errours. The Lord hath in such sort put the feare of his name, and the loue of his truth into our hearts, that we are free from charging our aduersaries vntruely, hauing a stronger way to worke by, then to take away euill by euill, and one lie with another. God hath

Ephe.5.13. giuen vs ye light to chase away your darkenesse, and the trueth of his Gospell to confute your errours with al your popish traditions, Iewish ceremonies, and damnable superstitions whatsoeuer.

Now followe the other three partes dispatched for haste or want of matter, al three in as litle roome, as halfe the first: wherein your order againe may be noted, that haue filled twenty leaues of your booke to Censure one leafe handled by the way in mine: and againe haue made shew of answere to fiftie leaues of mine with ten of yours. If you had kept on your proportion, of twentie for one, your Censures would haue stayed a longer time, & made a larger volume.

Touching the Man,

The 2. part, Concerning Edmund Campion, although you misse not your ordinary taunts against me in place of arguments for the cause yet hauing spoken nothing against him but a truth, I craue yet your pardon hauing deale but vp a seditious Iesuite, you could not wishe cause me of impietie. I thinke neither of his fatherhoode nor of his practise as you do, either to reuerence the one, or defende the other. Out of my

answere, you haue gathered together diuers accusations layd downe against him: but make no mention of the reasons wherupon those accusations were grounded: which iniurie you haue also done me, in other places. But if the same reasons bee briefly remembred, it will easely appeare, that whatsoeuer he sayeth or doeth, it is to hinder the course of the Gospell, & to trouble the peace of the lande, and therefore to be taken in most euill part. For, notwithstanding your defence, if he speake humblie, hauing the worke of pride in his heard and in his hand, he dissembleth: If he yeelde cõmendation where he hateth, it is daungerous flaterie: If he shew confidence in his weake arme, and against the Gospell that so preuayleth euery where, hee onely vaunteth: If he vnlawfully offer a triall of disputation denied by his fathers, and being him selfe in daunger of an other tryall, he meaneth no perfourmance: If he protest peace against his open and knowen practise of commotion, he must not be credited: If hee desire audience to open his mouth against the religion of God established, and to exalte the authoritie of Antichrist, whose noble banne by his two bulls, and double curse hath bene openly denoun-

Luke 20.27.
Rom. 3.
Tit. 1.

ceb against this noble Realme. For answer hereunto, I leaue him to them that may admitte and commit him to. But heere the reader may beholde howw little you haue to say in your Captaines defence, who allowe him in your booke little more then iii. leaues, of the which ii. are spent in prouing a question not denyed, and making much against your cause. For, prouing that religion standeth with obedience to magistrates, which you call temporall obedience, you must needes conclude that your Romish religion is no religion, because it casteth off this yoke of subiection layed vpon vs by the word, and bringeth in a forraine supremacie to rule and ouerrule all by his vsurped power and most vngodly practises. Therefore, taking in hande to confute it, you haue in deede confirmed my general conclusion: that Papists can not teach or maintene this pretended Catholike religion, but they must be traytours to GOD and enemies to the State. But because you bring diuill argumentes to proue this good conclusion: I must examine them, and lay vpon that errour, which is secretly and sophistically conueyed vnder a shew of probable and true propositions. First, to proue my

Luke 20.25.
Rom.13.1.
Tit.3.1.

my conclusion against God, her affirmeth Poperie to be the Catholique faith, which is to craue and beg the cause, and to affirme the chiefest matter in question. Your argumentes laide downe at large, will make this your order of disputation more playne, and the errour more sensible. Your former reason is this: whosoeuer calleth him an enemie to God, that maintenneth Poperie, vttereth the reproch of an vncleane mouth: All professors of the Gospell so holde and so call the maynteyners of Poperie, therefore all professors of the Gospel vtter the reproch of an vncleane mouth. In this reason the first proposition is brought, against all art, to proue and should it selfe be proued: it is placed first and should be placed last for the conclusion: for if hee could in a true argument proue and conclude that which is onely affirmed in the first assertion, the controuersie were at an ende. Therefore you speake in a purpose to disgrace the trueth, & not with arguments to proue your cause. Your second argument is thus framed: Whosoeuer speaketh against those ẏ would bring in a doctrine, contrary to the Gospell established, condemneth the former noble princes of England, ẏ Answ-

speaketh against them: therefore the Answ. condemneth the former noble princes of England. I graunt the second proposition: but the first is ful of vntruth. For I speake of the present estate and present practises among you: what is that to former states and former proceedings? I speake of subiectes, and the Censurer doeth drawe it to princes: I speake of them that dealt contrarie to the setled lawes, and he doth bring it as spoken against those, that made and maintained their owne lawes then in force. This one proposition being so false, can make no argument, but sophisticall for a shewe of trueth, when there is nothing in it but falshode. Also the Iesuites woordes haue an argument intended for him in this forme: what religion former princes from the conuersion of the lande vnto our age, haue maintained, that must not be condemned: but they haue maintained Poperie: therefore Poperie must not be condemned. The first proposition is false, for wee must liue by the rule of Gods worde, and not by the example of men, that may deceiue and be deceiued, as appeareth in the storie of the kinges of Israel and Iuda. The second proposition is false like the first. For since

Psal. 119. 105.
Ex. 23. 2.
Ezc. 20. 18

the

the conquest, as I haue partly shewed in my answere, Edward the first, Edw. the third, Richard the second, & others did set them selues, euen so long ago against ye tyrannie of Antichrist. And which is more, our Chronicles shewe that before Pseudoaustens comming, our religion was free from many superstitions, which he brought in: neyther did the Pope chalenge any preeminence of King Lucius, nor yet was it peelded him long after. But while you pleade the authoritie, and, as you account it, the Catholike regiment of some of those princes against me, you speake against your self secretly, opening your heart to discouer what you thinke of other Princes since, and namely of her Maiesties authoritie, and lawes establishing the Gospel. This is sufficient to discouer the counterfeit honour, and heartie hate to the present soueraigntie. It followeth that I answere your obiections to the second part of my conclusion: wherein I make all Papistes traytours, because they are of contrary religion to that which nowe standeth in force by the grace of God, and vnder her Maiesties blessed gouernement. What may be sayde of all Papistes generally, I leaue it as a

question,

question, which I haue not vndertaken: other men haue, if you will looke into their reasons. But for all reconciled Papistes employed with Saunders in Irelande, or entred to withdrawe the people in Englande: such as with Campion and his fellowes helpe forward some of the haynous attemptes that come to light from day to day, if I would holde my peace, themselues will bewray and confesse treason agaynst her Maiestie and the estate: beside open contempt agaynst the Lorde, and the free preaching of the Gospell. Neyther doeth my zeale ouerrunne my witte, in making mention of these matters, or my malice ouerlash all reason, as you haue tauntingly accused mee without cause. My zeale I wish increased according to knowledge, and against all your abominable superstitions: In malice I haue not dealt, but am carefull to detest all corruption in the seruice of God. Bishop Tunstall an authenticall witnesse, shal acquite mee of this reproche, who for like Rome practises, vseth more bitter and broade speaches, euen against your great Cardinall, Cardinall Poole. For hauing charged the Pope with his pestilent malice, (so hee speaketh) and

Poole

Poole as his instrument, afterwarde hee calleth the Cardinall an arrant traytour, of a deuilish purpose to destroye his natiue countrey, also that hee ranne headlongs into hell, and was (for this Romish matter) incomparably woorse then any Pagane. And will you call this hote doctrine? But to proceede, you note that religion standeth with temporall obedience. It is truely sayd of true religion: but Popish religion doeth take awaye from princes their supreme authoritie, making them the Popes vassalles and their people his tributaries. It warranteth all men to renounce and leaue their obedience, it dispenseth with all rebellion, and pardoneth any treason to those that are reconciled for the day of execution. He that hath an eye to see, or an eare to heare, may heare and see this, and some fruites thereof, both in the land and without, Your trayterous bulles, your actuall rebellion in the north, where D. Morton had the first bull, & where your Priestes also sayd masse in the tents: Stories trayterous shifte & chusing him an other king, and pleading him selfe no subiect to the Queene, whose subiection and protection hee vnnaturally

A sermon of Cuth. Bishop of Duresme printed. Anno 1539.

renounced, without any cause in the worlde giuen, but abusing her Maiesties clemencie: your seconde bull and seconde actuall rebellion vnder Saunders in Irelande: the alienating & mouing of the people by your opē Masses in Lākeshire & elswhere: your other attempres which came so neere the quicke procured by your Iesuiticall Masses of reconcilemēt: finally, Saunders booke allowing and extolling these rebellions and enterprises, canonizing the Captaines therof with the title of notable Martyrdome: what are they but open and actuall proofes, that there is in you a resolution to doe any thing you dare do, for the ouerthrowe of the present estate? It is openly layde to your charge that your malice is so great to some aliue, that you will be auenged of them, as you were in Cambridge of M. Bucer and Paulus Fagius fiue peeres after their death. Your example of the Apostles obedience to Magistrates of contrarie religion, proueth nothing for you, that holde not that doctrine, neyther yet followe their example. They and the faythfull in the primatiue Church, yeelded obedience to princes that beleeued not, and you doe it not to them that beleeue

Saunders of the visible monarch. in the 7. booke pag. 334. 732. 736.

and

and maynteine the Gospell, as it is proued agaynst you. The like examples followe: for the blessed Martyrs of late times did al patiently yeeld them selues to death, according to the doctrine which they professed, and witnessed their obedience aswell to the Prince as to GOD in their greeuous persecutions. In all my booke there is no such generall question propounded as you charge me with, that euery one of a contrarie religion, must needes be an enemie to the State. I haue alreadie answered, that true religion teacheth and yeldeth obedience to magistrates: but your religion bringeth euen Emperours vnder the subiection of the Pope, to giue their attendance at his gate, and at his stirrup, wherein you withdraw from Cesar that that is Cesars, aswell as otherwise you withholde from God that that is Gods. The malicious report which foloweth against some of our chiefe Prelates (as you speake) cannot bee prooued: nor your repeated taunt against our spirites, which if they were as euill as you make them, being compared with your, there would bee I graunt, no great difference. Touching those godly and learned men, Wickliffe, Luther and

Mat. 22. 21.

Caluine, whome you charge with daunge-
rous doctrine against Princes, I answere
that the light is no clearer at Noone, then
that they taught all obedience to be due to
Princes in the Lorde, and that for conscie-
ence sake without any rebellion: as in their
writings it remaineth, witnessed to all the
worlds. Luther vpon the fifth Commande-
ment, noteth for the sacred authoritie of
Magistrates, that this precept of obedience
to them commeth next to the Commande-
ment of obedience to God: adding that it
teacheth vs how to behaue our selues to-
ward all Magistrates, who are ordeyned
and appoynted of God. For Magistrates
are comprehended vnder the name of Pa-
rentes, being the cõmon Fathers of the cõ-
mon wealth. M. Caluin beside many o-
ther singular places of purpose handled,
to set forth the soueraintie of Magistrates,
hath these wordes in his institutions: God
hath not onely testified that he approueth
and accepteth of Magistrates office: but
hath moreouer set out the dignitie there-
of with most honorable titles of prayse,
marueilously commending the same.
Wherupon he citeth that, that God calleth
them Gods: concluding ꝑ their authoritie

Luth. in expos. decalogi Tom 7. pag. 8. 19.

Cal. inst. lib. 4. cap. 20. sect. 4.

is

is most lawfull and holy, and in all the life of man, a thing of all other most honest. Moreouer, hauing taught subiectes their duetie to obey Statutes, to pay tribute, to beare publique charge and office: hee proueth against al rebels, that if they rise against the Prince, they touch the annoynted of God. Thus the glorie of the Prince, is the good estate of the people: and the ioye of the people, is the blessed prosperitie of their Prince. I might shew the like doctrine out of Wickliffe, but it needeth not, after so sufficient proofes against you for M. Luther, and M. Caluin. If on the other side they had wordes in the places barely quoted by you in the margent, to proue that which you charge them with, I doubt not but you would haue set them downe at large and in the best maner. But for the conscience, this libertie it hath, that when a lawe is made against God, such as your popish lawes be, then the rule of the Apostle taketh place, It is better to obey God then man, which rule notwithstanding alloweth no rebellion at all, but teacheth the subiect to offer himselfe with all lowlines to the mercie of the magistrate, either to keepe a good conscience, or to witnesse

Psal.82.1.6. Iohn 10.35.

Act.4.19.

1.Pet.4.15. the integritie thereof to God, and his obedience to the Prince by a patient suffering. But, if we may beleeue your wordes, you condēne ȳ doctrine that teacheth subiectes not to obey the Prince for conscience sake: wherein, if it be your opinion indeede, you giue a sentence of condemnation against your selfe, and against all the recusants in England or fled beyond seas. But by this assertion euery man may see you make no conscience of a lie, which haue vttered one manifestly against your owne doctrine, dispensing with rebellion by the Popes Bulls, which is also taught in your bookes and from time to time discouered by your practises. Where shall we builde vpon your wordes and not be deceiued? when shall we thinke that you speake the trueth from your heart? Howe shall we looke for constant dealing towardes vs, when you are so inconstant toward your selues? But this is that I noted against Campion: a double minded man is inconstant in all his wayes. For the commotions (as you call them) in other countreys, by those of the religion, it is well knowen that they haue Edicts, Priuileges, and pacifications to cleere them from sedition: whereby also their

Saunders de vis. monar. lib. 7. Howlets booke.

Iam.1.8.

their good conscience and lawfull proceedings for the aduancement of religion is sufficiently auowed. Nowe you come to pleade the innocencie of the wolfe, because he hath sheepes clothing, or because it is not safe for him to breake into the foulde watched by diligent shepeheardes. You presume that we would not liue so quietly, if the state pressed vs, as you say your Catholiques are pressed. Howe vnquietly you haue dealt I neede not so often to repeate: how quietly we would abide in such times, our doctrine and former example of obedience doth moue a better expectation then you will conceiue. You complaine without cause, but it is high time both by bookes and by preaching, to prouoke the Prince in a zeale of Gods house, to exercise iustice against those, that will not be brought from their practises of rebellion to the loue of the trueth, no not by her exceeding mercie and rare clemencie. For seeing mercie taketh no more place with them, iustice is necessarie both in respect of her owne safetie, and in respect of her people, that the blessed preaching of the Gospell may continue established to vs, and to our posteritie for euer. I that can not, as you say, blush for

Psal. 69. 9.
Isa. 49. 23.
2. King. 18. 40.

my selfe, blush notwithstãding for you that are so full of bloud and crueltie, and yet charge our spirite as cruell and bloudie. For one fier in the time of your persecutiõ, consumed moe then haue been executed for religiõ only, & not attainted of some trayterous or fellonious intention in all the time of her Maiesties happie gouernement, notwithstanding so many offenders and so heinous offences of capitall Idolatrie. Therfore you had small cause to complaine of the iustice done in examining two or three of your traiterous cõfederates at the rack: for you cannot alledge one for a thousande of the tormentes, famines, cruell and lingering deathes, wherewith our brethren haue beene cõsumed vnder ỳ Pope, with no lesse outrage, then Nero, Domitian or Diocletian vsed against ỳ martyrs of Iesus Christ. What eyes hath the Censurer, that can note so smal sufferings against his felowes, and will not detest so detestable and sauage crueltie practised by the Popish inquisition where it can lay holde: concluded also, and, when time serueth, to be put in execution agaynst this lande by the conspiracie of Trent? In this complaint I finde, that the Censurer is ready with a litle helpe to

breake

breake out euen against the highest also: for he that is priuie to so infinite cruelties of the Pope, doth neuertheless exercise his stile to enlarge a small matter against her Maiesties iustice, saying that all Christendome, did talke of the late racking and tormenting of the Priests in the Tower. If this be true, you haue swift and many Curriers, that can giue so generall aduertisment in so smal time as vi. or vii. weekes. To aggreue this matter, hee saieth they were vertuous priests: and that they were tormented for their conscience, whereas he knoweth that beside their owne cofession, other euidences prooued them guiltie of such attempts as deserued ẏ their right roynt shoulde haue bene racked. All this vniust complaint and excuse of the priestes, content him not, but hee addeth moreouer a perswasion, that the same iustice in the Tower hath cast mens heartes into a horrour of such strange and vnwonted dealinges: wheras in very trueth there was no one of them so racked, but that, howsoeuer their minds seemed to yeelde to the feare of paine, they were yet worse afraied thē hurt. For the very next Sabboth day, though to the Churchwarde they must be drawen

or driuen or carried betweene two men like obstinate beares to a stake: yet could they after ꝑ sermõ walke home vpon their own legges stoutely ynough and strongly as other folkes. This is indeede to straine at a gnat and swallowe vp a camell, to complayne of iustice mercifully & necessarylye vsed to two or three, and your selues with all horrible tormentes to destroy great cities, and attempt the desolation of whole kingdomes. But to passe from this so causeleslie and foolishcomplaint, which may worthily hurt your cause: I nothing feare any losse that can come to our religion by so necessarie iustice. As for your last note of desperation, which may come by these torcures, it is not to be feared: you are so resolued (yf we may beleeue Campions protestation for himself and his fellowe Iesuites) & haue such a confidẽce in your cause, that there is no such feare: they are prepared by the whippe to endure greater things, especially in the cause you esteeme so great and so woorthy your sufferings. This neuertheleslie I may graunt you, that your euill cause may more charge and racke your consciences to desperation, then a thousande times more could doe to the godly

Matt. 23. 24.

godly martyrs, who haue founde it a ioy- Phil.1.29.
full thing, not onely to beleeue in Christ: but also to suffer for him.

The Censurer hauing vsed a large digression, returneth to the man, & finding his defence a barren matter, doeth only denie some things which in my answere were proued against him, secōdly adding a praise ꝑ al the gold in England wil not gile him: and that if he mette with me in equall balance I should appeare too light: which naked assertions may bee sufficiently answered with a bare deniall. Yet for a further answere, what is it to proue Campions quiet purpose by his owne naked woordes, when his open practises appeare to the contrary? For notwithstanding your scoffe, a man seeing little into common wealths, might easely see into these matters, and knowe both what the Iesuites superiours seeke, and what their instrumentes woulde bring to passe in this kingdome. Let any Nomb.23.8.
man iudge: will not the Iesuites bee as faithfull to their superiours as Balam the false Prophet was vnto the Lorde? Balam blessed where the Lord had blessed, and cursed where the Lord had cursed. And shal the Pope discharge her Maiesties subiects

of their Liegeance, and wil not Campion declare it? shall hee denounce the curse against her, and will not the Iesuites subscribe thereunto? But I will not agayne moue ꝑ which is already sufficiently prooued. Your tales of the Iaponian Iesuites, are neither of credit, being witten by themselues in their owne mayle: nor to the purpose if they be as quiet as they & you report. For eyther they are in the Portingales Ilandes and neede not, or, among the Heathenesse and dare not yet rebell. Secondly you will not seeme to vnderstande a plaine speach of your Golden day, so often by the goodnesse of God adiourned, or as I hope, for euer disappoynted: but expounde it as spoken onely of Campion and his loue of golde, the least suspicion whereof neuer entred into my thoughtes. But you haue here the seconde time deliuered that hard iudgement agaynst me, with other reproches, which I let passe. I knowe that notwithstanding any partishes or Parsons opinion at the balances, yet the iudgement appertaineth to the Lord.

Deut. 1. 17.

Touch,

Touching the matter.

NOw the Censurer is come to the matter, as appeareth by the title of the third part, which title sheweth that the rest hath beene from the matter, or about circumstances not so materiall. This is the like arte to that which hath bene noted. For howe absurde is it to haue spent so many leaues eyther from the chiefe purpose; or in things not so weightie, & now conclude that which hee calleth the matter in foure seely leaues and an halfe? But this is yet more absurde, comming but nowe to the cause it selfe, & giuing it so final allowance yet thereof to speake no one word directly to the question: For he was to proue, that it is not inconuenient for the state to moueire a disputation against the selues; against the lawes, & against religion, at hearing at challenge of a seditious Iesuite. But finding this hard to be proued, and my reasons not very easie to be confuted, he sleeth to the generall question, and proueth that disputation may bee sometimes graunted, which proposition was neuer denied. Let vs therefore consider what hee sayeth still from the matter. I alleadged the quiet continuance of re-

The third part.

of religion two & twentie yeeres free from Iesuites, and from all such chalenges: this is not a good reason vtterly to debarre all disputatiõ, neither was it so allcadged, but this seled peace maketh it an inconuenie thing, to admitte men guiltie of rebellion, to dispute agaynst the peace of the kingdome, and the authoritie of religion. Your pretensed continuaunce of Poperie a thousande yeeres without interruption, is clearly founde false, by many and great euidences: but if it were true, what doth it proue? If religion were reencred into Ierusalem, and there established two & twentie yeeres, woulde you thinke it conuenient that Mahomet shoulde bee admitted to dispute, because hee also can pleade many hundred yeeres prescription as wel as you? Passing ouer the reasons you thought good, as that of your obstinate purpose not to yeeld, which also maketh such disputation as you demaunde, very inconuenient: You repeate in the second place my argument of a small victorie ouer two or three last and least in the quarrell. To this you say somewhat in shewe, but it would proue nothing: because it is not in your power to performe, or in your purpose to doe it. For

doe

doe you esteeme your selues such pillars of Poperie, that al the Catholiques in England and abroade, so long and deeply settled in their religion, will presently yeelde, if you bee ouercome with demonstration of the trueth. Doe they stande no longer then you preuayle, or must they needes fal when you are ouerthrowen? If to shew ye trueth with vs, were the way to gayne you, you had beene gayned long agoe, as many thousandes haue bene. But some haue eies to see and will not see, they haue hearres to consider, and will not vnderstand. Campian in his chalenge forgate that which you do well aduertise him of, concerning his fellowes preast & readie to helpe him, if he should come to the danger of his chalenge. The thirde reason against your cauilling distinctions, is handled as vnlearnedly as all this thirde part: for I allege that the particular distinctions of Iesuites are vnlearned and peruish and you changing the question, disputes that distinctions generally are profitable. If this Censurer wil thus propound and assaile his own questions, he can obtaine no victory but against him self, and I can be but a witnesse of it. Distinctions I graunt, are generally good, and ons

Eze.6.15.

of the cheifest partes of a learned man consisteth in the knowledge how to distinguish aright. But what is this to proue all distinctions good, euen those that Iesuites make only to auoyde the power of trueth? Simples generally are good, seruing for the health of man, but what is this to proue those euill simples good, which haue lost their vertue, and which an euill Apothecarie may serue in place of good? for a triall of the Iesuites distinctions you referre me to their disputation: but I may haue a sufficient triall of them and of their disputation before hand in this your booke, if there were no other proofe to iustifie my report. As you would bring your quillies into credit, so you labour to bring my arguments and interpretations into discredit, as lying and false: but in a good conscience, and according to the trueth, I haue auowed them true and good, as will easely appeare to the indifferent reader. You that before made me much inferiour to Edmund Campion, now make me inferiour to thousandes of the Iesuites scholers. Whatsoeuer I am to the meanest of them, the Lorde, I trust, wil inable me to maintaine his trueth, euen against Campion your great champion,

to

to say nothing of his disciples. I confesse your distinctions offend mee as being full of subtilitie, and sometimes so darke and vnlearned, that there appeareth neither good cause nor good vse of them: yet you take it to heart that I should account them vnlearned and perrish. As for the accusatiõ of Iude against the despisers of good counsels, it was corruptly wrought against mee for reiecting your sophisticall deuises against the truetb: for proofe whereof I referre me to these poore distinctions chosen out of many for your purpose, which, one excepted, are all vnlearned and perrish, serving to put darknesse for light, and wolstrie in place of Gods seruice. For, as they that distinguish not, where the word hath distinguished, may soone fall into schisme and heresie: so also you in distinguishing where the word admitteth no distinction, do offend in like sort, and with no lesse danger. There is you say, a cleare difference betweene an idol and an image. Surely this is somewhat that you saye: for an idol is the image of the superstitious Gentiles, and an image is the Idol of idolatrous and falsely named Christians. There is I graunt, a cleare difference in the let-

Iude 10.

ters, but no difference at all in the word, no more then is betweene Omnipotent and Almightie. For (to passe by Phauorine, Hesychius and some places in Plutarch, who all make these two words of one signification) Plato maketh the matter most euident, who mouing a question what εἴδωλον should be, maketh this answere, [illegible] It is manifest we will make answere that those things are idoles, which are seene in water, and in looking glasses, and those moreouer that are painted or set out in types or portratures, & other things of this sort whatsoeuer. By these words of Plato the Censurer may learne that any image carued, paynted, represented by a glasse or seene in water, is among the Grecians, where the worde is in his owne countrie and proper vse, called an Idol. Tullie moreouer who could as well iudge of the Greeke worde, εἴδωλον and of the Latine word image as the Censurer, be in his translatiõ maketh them one. Lastly, to returne to the holy Scriptures, God in the second Commandement, forbiddeth both the making and worshipping of an

Phauorine. Hesychius. Plutarch.

Plato in dialog. [illegible]

Cicero in Phænon. Arati.

Image to represent the true God, or any of the false Gods. Thus much to shewe your vnlearned and most vntrue distinction beeweene an Image and an Idol, which you and your fellowes repeate so often and vrge so much. You doe it to vpholde Idoles vnder a more honest title of Images (as you suppose) but as they differ not in name, so in nature they are all one, euen stumbling blockes of offence, the worshippers whereof are open idolaters. I am taught by the word of GOD, that there were materiall and are still spiritual sacrifices in the Church: but for sinne I read ꝑ there is no sacrifice without bloud. So that your second distinction of bloudie and vnbloudy sacrifices is plainly against scripture: Iustice by faith wee acknowledge: but merite by workes is proued to be against the worde. So the mediation of Christ is according to faith, but your intercession of saintes against the scripture. For who is more mercifull then the Lorde that he may saue? or who more ready to heare vs, that he may be the Lordes remembrancer? faith that beleeueth the promise, and hope that patiently waytetb for the issue of faith we acknowledge, and the distinction

Exod.29.38.
Heb.8.3.
1.Pet.2.5.
Heb.13.15.
Heb.9.22.

Abac.2.4.
Rom.3.28.
Gal.2.15.6.
1.Ioh.2.1.
1.Tim.2.5.

Rom.4.3.
Heb.4.1.
1.Thess.5.8.
Tit.3.7.

I haue layde downe in the ninth article. Your counterfeit traditions of men and of the Apostles, are al without warrant in the causes necessary to saluation. But why haue you left out the distinction of the two worshippings, Latria to God, and Dulia to images? Is it left out because wee condemne it, and you now allowe no more of it? All these distinctions are most daungerous, when you will with some distinction or change of a name, retaine still the same iniquitie, forging such wicked deuises of man, to disanull the truth of God. Therefore they are but your vntrue assertions and vaine braggs, that you distinguishe things into their proper natures, that you can prove eche part of your distinction consonant to the word of God: that when you haue so distinguished, wee haue no more to saie: that wee bewray our ignorance, and finally that the truth is made manifest to euery mans eyes. When any one of these fiue definitiue sentences is proued true, I will acknowledge the rest. I much maruaile that in such vanting speach, you would not set down one true assertion of so many. But you care not what you say to reproche the godly, making account

that

that your owne side will take it in good part, be it neuer so vntrue, neuer so reproch-full. The fourth argument touching the libertie of your pen, I haue answered already: but I answere further, you may haue it without print: and if that will not content you, there are printes inough neerer hande beyonde seas where you are, if we may beleeue you so often affirming it. The daunger & persecution you speake of, is a fruite of your murmuring spirits, complaining without a cause. For you go safely away in many matters: & as much as you cõplayne against vs openly, as intercepting all your bookes & other Popish stuffe, I thinke you doe much more brag among your selues of many escapes. But if you had as many prints as you can set a worke, what can you of lesser giftes write, that the most learned of your side haue not written long agoe, as Ecchius, Pighius, Hosius: and which nowe Turrianus, Andradius, doe not furbish in a vaine hope, at last to make an ende of Sisyphus labour. What issue all these haue had of coursing & discoursing againe, the questions betweene you and vs, we may consider it with great ioy of heart, & you in this kingdome and in our neighbour king-

domes may behold it with veratiõ of spirit. Therefore notwithstanding your braggs before you come to the triall, and that you tell vs, misusing the place, in the forehead of your booke of the fier in the mountaine, yet we feare no more to encountre with you then they that see their enemies without armoure, or ouerthrowne before they come to giue them the charge.

Deut. 5. 5.

Lastly you like not my opinion, that only the Scriptures should bee admitted for iudges in disputation. But the opinion is good, and the practise needefull, seeing the holy scripture is the onely touchstone to make triall, and the onely iudge to giue sentence in all questions apperteyning to the doctrine of fayth and saluation. Howe reuerently I thinke of the chiefe councils of the fathers and doctors, and what profit I acknowledge to come by their great labour, it was declared in my answere. But you euermore omit that which maketh not for your purpose, wherein you take an euil but yet a readie waye to condemne a good cause. Notwithstanding to determine controuersies in iudgement of religion, I admit them no seate: but refuse them al not onely with one breath, but with this one

short

your sentence: The rule is not ouerruled. You shoulde haue proued that the doctours and councils haue not places contrary one to another, and sometimes contrary to them selues: If you had cleered them of this warre among themselues, you has made them somewhat fitter to make peare amongst vs. In affirming that I say some of the fathers are condemned of forgerie, you doe manifestly peruert my playne wordes: for I spake of the places, and you drawe it to the persons. It is one thing to say some places in Austen are forged, and an other to say Austen him selfe is forged. Now that places in Austen are forged, and namely many of his short sermons to the brethren in the wildernes, it appeareth by the iudgement of Erasmus, and by the notes of bastardie set downe in your owne editions. Cyprians places are also acknowledged by your selues, especially that notorious booke of the reuelation of Iohn Baptistes head, where Cypriane maketh mention of king Pipin that liued fiue hundred yeeres after that Cypriane was dead. But I neede not to alleadge any more, you wil not deny but there are many. Now there followeth a comparison, that you

Aug. ad frat. in Eremo.

Cypr. de reuel. capitis Iohn Bap.

ground your beliefe onely vpon the word of God, and make it the onely obiect of faith more thē we do. Your reports here, and in the ninth place confirmed with an other, can haue no credit against your knowen doctrine and dealinges to the contrary. For doe you not in this verie question, pleade the authoritie of men, as the warrant whereby we receyue the Scriptures? Doe you not denie that wee are saued by faith onely? Howe then doe you buylde your beleefe onely vpon the word of God? or make that the onely obiect of faith, more then we doe?

In the wordes following you keepe on your course, prouing that which is graunted, and affirming that which shoulde bee proued. I dyd graunt that Councils, Fathers and stories yeeld profitable helpes to shewe the estate of the Church from time to time, and also for the better vnderstanding of the worde of God: yet this is that which you make ꝑ quest̃ as denyed by me, and to be proued by you. After this strange order of disputation, you myght as fitly in forme, and more truely in matter, proue your doctrine blasphemous, and your practises

ties full of rebellion. If you woulde proue this, it were a true proposition, but no confutation of that I say affirming the same. So in prouing that doctors bring great helpes to learning, you proue a trueth, but not in any ouerthrowe of my answere: For I haue acknowledged as much. The questiō indeede is, whether Councils and Fathers be iudges to giue sentence in controuersies, and rules to ouerrule interpretations: to the proofe whereof you shoulde haue tyed your selfe: but without any further proofe you affirme it, as a cleare matter and altogether out of dout. Is this that disputation which you so boast of, to proue that is graunted, and to leaue that without proofe which is in question? I shall not escape the note of audacitie, If vpon your Censures false report, I shal be thought to denie that which I doe most manifestly auouch. But this note of audacious bouldnes cleaueth to you, who blush not to say, that the authoritie of Scriptures dependeth vpon the testimonie and allowance of men: and that otherwise, we know not which is the word of God and which not. As many as hold this opinion had neuer their eares bored, nor their heartes opened by the

Spi-

Spirite of GOD, to heare and see more then the bare letter, they neuer felt the lyfe and spirite thereof, which is the holy spirite of God, not onely bearing witnesse with our spirite, that we are the sonnes of God, but also that the holy scriptures, are the worde of God, and his power to saluation: that they are also the rule which should rule all, and not be ouerruled of any. Neither haue those disciples of the word, humbled them selues at the footestoole of the Lorde, to behold his absolute perfection in all his wayes, especially in the full reuelation of his will to the sonnes of men by his holy scriptures: neither haue they considered ẏ vanitie of vanities, & ẏ infinite hardnesse of heart and corruption of iudgement which is in all flesh. This humilitie would confirme them in the faith of that saying, no man knoweth the things of God, but the spirit of God. This Spirit leadeth vs into all trueth, to knowe it and to proue it, and to be comforted thereby, not in the iudgemẽt or after the sense of man, but according to the worke of God opening our hearts, and sanctifiyng our vnderstanding, so that the worke and iudgement is of the spirite according to the woorde of God.

Rom.8.16.
Esai.53.1.
Rom.1.16.
Rom.11.34.
Iere.17.9.
1.Cor.2.11.
Iohn.16.13.
Act.16.14.

Here-

Herein also standeth an answere to your se-
conde assertion, that by the fathers wee
knowe which is the right meaning of the
word of God, for as the authoritie of the
worde is confirmed by the spirit, so are the
interpretations thereof also. As man is
not the author, so he is not the interpreter
of the worde of God, otherwise then by the
autoritie of the worde it selfe. This saint
Peter proueth, making it a reason why no
Scripture is of a priuate interpretation, 2.Pet.1.20.
because it came not from man: but the ho- 21.
ly men of God spake as they were moued
and caried with the holy Ghost: so that the
holy Ghost doeth deliuer, and warrant, and
interprete vnto vs the holy woord of God,
expounding scripture by scriptures, and
not leauing this high office to men, other-
wise then to ministers contenyning them-
selues within the faithfull seruice of their
charge in their written and authenticall
commission. And you dare not say (who
dare say much) ꝑ an interpretation is true,
because an ancient father hath it, but be-
cause he hath it according to a trueth, and
the trueth according to the word. Hierome
is a notable father of singular gifteſ, but,
to passe ouer other places, I verely thinke
you

Hieron. comment. in epist. ad Gal.

you woulde censure him, for his interpretations vpon the eleuenth verse, of the seconde chapter to the Galathians: and vpon the sixt verse of the thirde chapter, I write them not downe because I am desirous to couer such blemishes, among other excellent gifts. Whether the visible Catholike Church may erre or no, which must be considered in the particular members and doctrine thereof, I will for a triall admitte the example of your Church, but not the prese̅t testimonie. Their example doeth testifie ꝑ Apostasie, which their testimonie will not acknowledge, though they should do it to iustifie the prophecies that were deliuered of it before, and are nowe made so cleere as nothing may be more. To your manifold examples brought to proue that heretiques cleaue to the scripture: I answere first, ꝑ heretiques also cleaue to traditions & ordinances receiued by word of mouth, as appeareth by the complaint of Ireneus against them. Secondly the Scripture is the worde of God in his manifest sense and construction of trueth and life, and not according to the naked letter, whereunto, I graunt the heretiques did peeuishly sticke, as you also doe, where it maketh for your pur-

2. Thes. 2. 3. 1. Tim. 4. 1. Apoc. cap. 13. & 14. &c.

Ireneus lib. 3. cap. 11.

purpose. The philosophicall prooles which some haue made, as you say, for the wonderfull mysterie of Christes two natures and willes, prove not so much for philosophie, as you woulde inferre therby: for without philosophie the scripture hath sufficient prooles for that necessarie doctrine, as hath beene declared. But by the way, where is your iudgement in this assertion? debate the matter with your selfe, and you shall finde howe vnpossible it is for natural philosophy to determin the supernaturall misteries of the vnitie of God and man, & of two natures and willes in one person Iesus Christe, which was a worke of God as great as the creation of the world. Notwithstanding I haue acknowledged, that philosophie being corrected and sanctified by the woorde, may also be some helpe to heauenly wisedome, but without it the woorde is sufficient, to open all the counsell of God which appertyneth vnto vs.

Thus we take not away (as you charge vs) ye vse of Counsells, Fathers, & other like helpes, be cause of an abuse ye may bee, but stand against them, ye vnder colour of ye vse thereof woulde bring in and reserme the abuse. Therefore how doth the Censurer doth accuse

cuse without conscience, and giue sentence without iudgement? who doth depriue you of these helpes? Who doth call you to the bare letter? How often am I enforced to repeate one thing to answere the same slaunder? As Councils and Doctors of Philosophie may helpe, wee allowe them and vse them: as Iudges we admit them not: and although we answere you to them when they are alleadged, yet knowe, that it is of that measure that is pressed downe and floweth ouer, we are not bound vnto it with any condition. But what reasons are these that followe in the Censure? Euche man may deny the Scripture to be Scripture, or wrangle at pleasure vpon the sense, therefore wo must admit Councils, Doctors, and Philosophie. This argument is very vnlearned and peremptorie against the maiestie of Gods worde. A wicked man may wickedly take exceptions against it, therefore it is not sufficient: they may deny or wrangle vpon the sense, therefore we must leaue the certaine touchstone of God, and bee tryed by the vncertaine coniectures of men. If the Iesuite had not abandoned all worldly commodities, as not caring for the good blessings of

Luk, 6. 38.

God

God in this behalfe, I might easily confute this reason by one drawne from a lesse assurance, and lesse importance. An enemie may deny the Censurers euidences of land, or wrangle vpon the sense of the wordes, therefore he must not stand vpon them, but seeke other testimonies to mainteine his title. But if these helpes or (as you meane) if the authoritie of men bee taken away, it is as much as to saye, controuersies in religion shall neuer be ended. Wherein againe you make this weake and wicked argument: if controuersies in religion be euer ended, it must not be by the Scriptures only, but by Councils, Doctors and Philosophie. This is therefore the effect of your Censure and definitiue sentence in this matter: that which God cannot doe by his worde, men may by their writings: that which God cãnot determine by his trueth, men may ende and conclude by their lyes. And further to examine this your bould and dangerous conclusion, into what a sea doe you drawe vs, calling vs to passe by the examination and iudgement of so many, so large, so doubtfull and so contrarie writers? If the worde be darke, are not the Fathers darker? If the Scriptures bee

doubtfull,

doubtfull, are not mens writings infinitely more doubtfull? If any heretique or wicked man dare wrest the holy scriptures of God, will he not much more dare to peruert, to denie, and to treade vnderfoote the writings of a mortall man? It came from the deepest bottom of the Sea, to draw men from the certeincie & safetie of Gods word, to the daunger and vncerteincy of mens iudgement. Concerning the heresies you mention, as Trinitaries in Transiluania, Anabaptistes in Poland, Adamites in Germanie, I pray God wheresoeuer these or any other heresies bee taught, that they may be vtterly rooted out, together with all other weedes that growe vp of their owne accorde, wheresoeuer the Plowe is neglected. For Huttites in Bohime, for any thing I know in substance of Religion, also for Caluinistes in France, I answere, they are no heretiques, neither doe they carie these names, but by your slanderous speach, that, to bring the Gospell of God into cotempt, would make it to be thought the doctrine of those men, whom the Lorde raised vp as notable instruments to publish it in their time, and as singular lighes to chase away the mist, which you had

bought

brought in, in all places of your darke and sinfull kingdome. How farre we differ from Lutherans in some poynces, you are not the fittest man to whome I may make complaint. But howsoeuer you haue added your marke in the margent, Note this, yet the Scripture is no cause of this disagreement. Under the name of Caluanistes you charge the Estate of this land with heresie: for albeit we receiue not the name, neither build our faith vpon the doctrine of any mã, yet the Estate maynteyneth the doctrine which vnder that name you call heresie. But you would onely seeme to lay that reproch vpon France. In England you saye there are Puritanes & the Familie of loue. What an high and deepe slaunder is this to all the godly in this kingdome from the prince to the meanest person professing the religion? your Catholikes excepted, are all in England either to bee charged with the odious name of Puritanes, or with the most execrable abominations of the Familie of loue? What would not this your spirit attempt in the aboundance of your heart, if you durst as well come to open action, as you dare cast out these open and intollerable slaunders against all the godly

entred. We all holde the same doctrine of faith, published and mainteined according to the worde of God: we come to the same fellowship and communion in the exercises of religion, and ioyne all in the same defence of Gods holie Gospell, yea we all, though not in the same measure, seeke the reformatiõ of that, that at the Lordes time shalbe reformed to a further growth and beautie in the bodie of Iesus Christ, which is the Church. Therefore notwithstanding your slaunder, vpon examination it wil appeare, that those in Englande, which are slaundered with the name of detestable Heretiques, are farre from the heresie, & most readie to condemne it, or whatsoeuer is contrarie to the publique doctrine of faith, mainteined by the present Lawes of the lande, which doctrine is pure and holy, and agreeable to the most holy word of God, which the Lorde continue for his names sake with peace vpon Israel. But to returne to the Censurer, hee addeth a manifest vntruth, saying that all the former heresies ioyne against the Romish Church, in receiuing the scripture onely. To wade no further, the familie of loue, which you cite, are against you, who haue their seuerall

Eph. 1. 23.

Gospell

Gospell of the kingdome, they build vpon the cursed & thyse cursed bookes of H.N. also they scorne the scripture learned, and in their loue to you, acknowledge ý ministerie of ý word to come frō the Pope. Therefore they do neyther cleaue only to ý scriptures, nor liue in such mislike of your superstitions. Nowe for the matter, if your argument be good: Heretiques cleaue to the word onely, therefore it is naught: you may aswell conclude, that we must not alleadge the Scriptures at all, because they alleadge them: we must not dispute at all because they dispute: which conclusions are all absurd. For heretiques eate and drinke, they clothe them selues, all which are lawfull for all men to doe: therefore not whatsoeuer they doe, but whatsoeuer they doe as heretiques, that is a marke of heresie. Furthermore to proue wantes in the worde of God, you demaunde howe it commeth to passe that the Scripture doeth not ende controuersies among heretiques. I answere they are in the faulte, as you also like heretiques are by resisting the trueth: the worde is not to bee charged with any want. But let me moue the like question, and haue your Censure touching

Euang. regni.

the doubt. You that haue the Scriptures, the Councils, the Fathers: you that haue Philosophie moreouer, and stories; and which is most of all, the Popes breast and the fulnesse of the spirite you brayge off: howe commeth it to passe that you haue not yet compounded your troublesome and long controuersie, whether the virgin Marie was conceyued without originall sinne or no? If the euidences you so stande vpon cannot in so long time ende so small a matter, what will they be able to proue in the great questions of saluation? Agayne bedemaūdeth how such heresies can be, yf ꝑ truth be so cleare. For triall of the truth & a manifest proofe what power there is in Gods worde, there must be heresies and schismes: and God hath alwayes suffered false prophets & teachers for a iust punishment of those that loue not the trueth: nouertheless the Scripture is cleare and plaine, where God giueth an eare to heare, and a heart to vnderstand: if it be hidden, it is hidden to them that are lost. But you that once or twice beate at mee, as one whose zeale ranne before his witte, staye your selfe. Doe you ꝑ make no conscience to diminish the authoritie of the worde of God,

2.Pet.2.1.

2.Cor.4.3.

God, crye out agaynst vs, if wee refuse the determination of men? Will you that haue alreadie in diuers places pleaded against ye sufficiencie of Scriptures, now pleade for Philosophie, Doctours and Councils, as able to end al controuersies & ratifie your title? If we call you onely to the worde, not the bare woord, but adorned and richly attired with all fulnes of light and truth, the cleerest interpreter of it selfe, doe wee in calling you hither, deprue you of your euidences and witnesses, seeking thereby to set you together by the eares for the title? I knowe no euidences but the worde, no witnesses but the holy Prophets and Apostles: if your kingdome can not iustific it selfe by these euidences and witnesses, let her bee condemned by them for euer. Your headroule of fathers naming heretiques ye abused ye Scriptures, I tooke not the tale of them, they are brought in as vnnecessary witnesses of a matter alreadie answered, & not in question. Lastly you conclude, that we drawe in one line with the most cursed heretiques, and you make them our progenitors, because we appeale to the worde of God, as the onely teacher and iudge in causes of religion. If this be a faulte, let it be

John. 5. 39.

required at our hande: if it be your horrible slaunder against the worde and agaynst the Saints of God, for giuing due honour thereunto, ꝓ Lord require it at your handes in the defence of his owne glorie.

Touching Christian Franken.

The fourth parte.

TOuching Christian Franken, which is the last of your foure partes, it appeareth he hath vsed a true reporte agaynst the Iesuites, because (as hee assured him selfe before hande) yet no man hath denyed the idolatries, the superstitious and heathenish exercises, wherewith he doth so plainly charge them. As for the first part of your answere hereunto, it standeth altogether vpon false argumentes, as that, He departeth from the sect of Iesuites, therfore he is an apostata: He discouereth their wicked superstition, therefore he reuileth al catholike religion: Austen confesseth that hee knew none worse then they that fel in Monastical life, while he liued, therfore Frankē must be one of them. All these conclusions are barely affirmed without proofe: & therefore may be truely denied without any further answere. Notwithstanding, it is to bee

ug. ep. 137.

noted,

ed, that againe you find no fitter taunt
inst M. Luther and John Bale, then
all them Friers: and therefore you re-
te the matter. True it is they were Fri-
, but forgiue them that fault, seeing they
cast away their habit, and kept a better
rse. An other reproch followeth in char-
g vs plainely with coyning the newes
Rome, and with suspition to haue coy-
Frankens Dialogue: whereunto I
were if we haue not coyned, you haue,
as for Austēs place, it maketh for him
inst whome it is alleadged, and against
n in whose defence you bring it. For if
lustens time with some good, this Mo-
ticall life brought forth others so euill
none were worse, and hath declined e-
since, it was time for Franken to come
from the middest of you. If so long a-
in such puritie of the Church, as was
ustens time, the Monasteries did bring
h ÿ worst men of all others, what did ÿ
ysters foller afterwardes? Your other
e of Austen to proue it a great fault, to
ock many for one or two, I graunt to
rue, but for your purpose falsely allead-
, because it is not one or two of you, or
twe as one or two hundred which are
accused

accused of superstition & hypocrisie, but ꝑ accusation is against you all, for you apparell idolatrie with the name of deuotion, you nourish ambitiō vnder a Friers weed, and seeke an empire vnder a Priestes gaberdine, you exercise a Molues rauening crueltie vnder Sheepes clothing, Treason is conscience among you, and a iust execution is made a glorious martyrdome. These are the diseases that haue infected the hearte, and spread them selues as a leprosie, throughout all the bodie of your vnholy orders and irreligious men. So that we blame not many for a fewe, but cannot finde a few to hope wel of, in so great & diuers swarmes. This is not my complaint as you knowe, or of this time alone, but the complaint of many and long agoe. Therefore in drawing Saint Austens wordes to condemne mee as insulting against Christ and his religion, for the fall of some one religious man, is to drawe him against his will, to condemne one for another, as was noted before.

Sander. de visib. Monarch. lib. 7.

Your seconde exception to Frankens dialogue is taken, because in your opinion, he applieth good thinges in the societie to euill purposes, by which practise you haue

well

well noted that any good thing in religion or policie may be depraued. This practise you shoulde haue prooued in Franken, so ỳ exception had bene good: but you affirme it onely, as a man whose word must be taken for a proofe, & his opinion for an oracle. What Franken hath written you see, what he can write to a further accusation of the Iesuites life I knowe not: I thinke it was his minde to passe by personal matters, and to note onely the corruptions and superstitions of their orders and doctrine: for which cause also he was alleaged. Your bitter taunts against our ministerie as loose, are accusations reaching to him that wil not be pacified for the sin, with all your vnbloodie sacrifices. The ignorant and vnfit ministers we defende not, or any that may among so many be iustly accused of loosenes: but the godly preachers receiue the testimonie of learning and godly life, euen their enemies being made iudges. Whereas you finde a place in the dialogue to commende Iesuites for great labour, diuine meditations, chastising of the flesh and such like, I answere there is an vse and abuse in some of these actions: you are charged with the

abuse.

abuse. The rest, as your whippe and voluntarie abandoning of Gods blessings, both are superstitions, as was noted before in a fitter place. You remember who complayneth, that of all iniust men, they are most iniust, which when they doe most deceiue, and greatest harme, they do it notwithstanding that they may be esteemed good men. Againe, wherin you haue a singular grace, you taunt vs as that we can not well bee charged with such faultes as you count vertues in the Iesuites. True it is we wish not to be charged with the righteousnes of Scribes and Pharisees, but seeke a righteousnes that may exceede it, such as standeth in the synceritie of a good conscience according to godlines.

Cic. off. lib. 1.

Mat. 5. 20.

1. Tim. 1. 5. & 19.

The thirde and last exception is against Frankens conuersion, as not strong to prooue any thing, seeing you can presse vs with many examples for one, which is your franke and bould assertion. But if you cannot truely alleadge a man for a citie, or a towne for a kingdome, this is a note who it is that in deede dare venture vpon any assertion, though all the worlde see the vanitie and vntrueth thereof. In place of manye, two examples are brought in with

their

their pretended reasons. But first you giue sentence before the triall, that Franken departed from vs vpon a fancie, and your fellowes vpon great reasons and inuincible proofes. For Franken I answere, though I knowe he be not throwly cleansed from the dregges of Poperie, but carieth some corruption that hath infected the hearte, (which you haue not at all blamed him for) yet his reasons of departure were such as enforced him therunto, being otherwise superstitiously addicted and desirous to continue. Of your two men I can saie nothing, I knowe not what roote they had take, that were so soone withered. But you that condemned me without cause, as blaming al your Catholiques for the fault of one, abusing a sentence out of Austen against mee for that purpose, what is it that your selfe now bring in two runnagates to the slaunder of all, that constantly remaine in the trueth? must it bee no faulte in you that was made so haynous in mee? There are belike some indulgēces from the pope, that what you do shalbe no fault, and what you say shalbe no lye. Aug. ep. 137.

To come to your two runnagates Kalander and Flaschius, albeit you auowe

their

their proofes of running out, to be great and inuincible: yet they are in deede so insufficient, that they haue plainely condemned thē selues by ý apologie, wherein they seeke to be iustified: & may soone finde better arguments why to returne, if their true repentance did opē a doore for their reentrie.

1 For what reason is the first, that Xilander giueth? The Catholiques haue endured these fifteene hundred yeeres in concorde of one doctrine, and 16. sectes haue sprong of Luther within these sixtie yeres, therefore he departeth to you: First this reason standeth vpon two false, and often confuted assumptions: For neither hath the Popish Church endured so long, nor so many sects so lately growne vp of Luther. Secondly, though the assumptions were true, yet the argument doth not followe. For if antiquitie might prooue a Church, the Iewes would make a great clayme to the title: If sects springing vp, prooue no Church, what shal we say to the Churches of God at Corinth and in Galatia? Xilander did but salute our religion as passing by, that had no better reason of his falling away then this, so often and so many wayes confuted.

His seconde reason that moued him to leaue our religion for Poperie, is succession of Bishops in the Popish Church, from Christ till now, which some Fathers make a great reason. Surely those fathers knew some good by the bishops that had bene before their time, but they could not iudge of the Apostacie of these that came after to occupie that Chaire. Againe those fathers esteemed not so much a Succession of persons, as the succession of doctrine, which is farre from the bishops of Rome, that teach many things against the word, and against the practise of the Primatiue and true Apostolique Church, as hath beene declared. But poor Xilander that maketh this Succession a vrgable motiue (as you speake) moueing him to reuolt, did he consider the first, graunted Schismes when one Pope cursed and persecuted an other, to the horrible slaughter of all sortes of people in that Citie? Did he note your two Popes, & two Popedomes together at one time, yea somtime three, somtime foure Popes, who kept the Chaire somtime at Rome, somtime at Auinion, somtime in other places? Did hee euer consider, that they which were the stoyes of these men, can not agree

Plat. in vita Ioh. 14. &c. Onuph. Pan in Com.

agree either in the number, nor in the succession of these your Popes? Any one of all these, or of many other matters witten by your selues, being well cõsidered, might haue bene a weightie cause to keepe him from that fall. For these bishops, many of them succeeded with such wicked conditions, and for so wicked purposes, that their succession may shewe out matter to proue them rather the race of Antichrist, and the spirit of fornications, which long agoe begaune to worke the mysterie of iniquitie: but hath nowe made vp all the measures thereof, so that the prophesie is fulfilled, that Antichrist in the succession of his ministers exalceth hum selfe against all that is called God, or is worshipped, and sitteth in the Temple boasting him selfe that he is God. This is that succession of Antichrist, which is glorious in the eyes of flesh and bloud, and therefore made Wooderman departe from Christ, whom whosoeuer wil folowe, must euery day take vp his Crosse and folow him.

Hos. 4. 12.
2. Thess. 2. 4.
Luke 9. 23.

3 As for his third reason of miracles in the Popishe Church, I leaue it as very false & insufficient. Notwithstanding some I graunt wil beleeue if a man come from the

Luke 16. 30.

the dead which wil not beleeue Moses and the Prophets. The kingdome and Church of Christ was planted in the power of doctrine and miracles, and also by the power of the holy Ghost, while Christ and his Apostles liued. Now it is against faith, if any looke for miracles to confirme the Gospell againe, which is already so confirmed, that an Angel from heauen or any miracle worker perswading otherwise, must bee accursed. By miracles it is an easie thing to deceiue and bee deceiued, seeing Satan to that purpose changeth himselfe into an Angell of light. Such were many of the lying miracles not onely printed from Rome, but receiued and registred at Rome, and thrust vpon mens consciences to beleeue, being matters that might easily drawe them headlonges into all error and idolatrie, as was prophesied of this kingdome of Antichrist, and hath nowe appeared by the lamentable effect. Therefore his third reason was to weake to haue drawen him frō the Church of Christ, if he had beene tied to it but with one bande of loue, to the trueth and power of doctrine.

Gal. 1. 8.

Apoc. 13. 13.

4 Xilanders foueth reason doth huddle vp and confound many reasons: As that he was moued with the authoritie of the

vniuersall, of the visible, and of the Catholique Church: where like a good plaine dealer, he left out that which he founde not in the Romish Church, namely holinesse. And what are all the rest without this holinesse? Againe of those three notes that moued his falling off, two are all one in worde and sense. For the worde vniuersal, and the word Catholique, are as these two wordes, Wodeman and Xilander, which do not signifie two, but one and the same thing. That the Church of God must alwaies haue a visible and glorious Maiestie vpon the earth, is not yet proued. Also that the Church of Rome was neuer Catholique or vniuersall, as it pretendeth, the Churches of ye East, while they florished, & the Greeke Churches, such as remayne at this day, doe make sufficient proofe. Againe we receiue the Scriptures from God, hee by inspiration hath giuen them, and hath alwayes kept them in his arke, and the Philistins could not keepe the Arke from vs. The pretended victorie ouer heresies must be proued, before it be admitted for a reason. I graunt the Romish Church hath had a victorie and a trymph in outwarde shewe ouer many thousand Saints, most cruelly murdered for the trueth. But ouer

A
2 Tim. 3. 16.
1. Sam. 5. 10.

heresies

heresies it trymphed not, but in the time of her chastitie before the Lorde had giuen her a bill of diuorce: after which time shee embrewed her selfe in the bloud of the Saintes and became the mother of all fornications. With his other reasons hee linketh Saint Augustines saying, so often misalleadged to proue the authoritie of the Church aboue the Scriptures: that he woulde not beleeue the Gospel, but onely vpon the Churches authoritie. By these wordes his minde was not to determine which had greater authoritie, the Church or the Scriptures: but to declare against the Manichees, in his owne practise what wrought him first to esteeme the worde at his conuersion from infidelitie. The authoritie and consent of the Church, may in such a case perswade one to receyue the worde, which being receyued, is of it selfe founde to be greater then that which first perswaded. Thus of many reasons heaped vp together in ỳ fourth place, there is not founde one good. The Romish Church was neuer vniuersall or Catholike, but particular, and of one territorie though by vsurpation it enlarged her selfe by litle and litele: and the visiblenes therof is nothing, for the true Church of the elect is inuisi-

Apoc.17.5.

Aug.contra epist. fundã. Manichæi. cap.5.

ble. Moreouer (as I declared) it neuer triumphed ouer heretikes, it hath not any peculiar custodie of the Scriptures, neyther doeth the authoritie of the Gospel depende vpon hir ratification, being authenticall of it selfe. Therefore al these reasons and put them together, coulde not open the least dore for his departure, if he had euer beene placed within the Church.

5 The fift reason is that the Romish Church is the true Church, because many that liued there, are nowe Saintes in heauen, and namely Dominic and Frauncis, as Xilander doeth imagine. I say as before, there was a time when Ephraim spake, & there was trembling, he exalted him selfe in Israel, but he hath sinned in Baal and is dead. Neuertheleſſe seeing Xilander went so farre for a fift reason, let vs examine what he hath brought. There is no doubt saith he, but Dominic, Frauncis, and others are Saintes in heauen, therefore it cannot bee that they liued in errour. Who hath made it out of doubt to vs that they are in heauen, seeing there are written so many impudent lyes and blasphemies of them in the Legenda, and that most detestable Alcaron called the booke of conformities? who will beleeue that Dominic rayse the dead

Hos. 13. 1.

Martyrolog. Vsuardi. prid. Non. Aug.

dead which you teach? Who can heare or reade those your blasphemies in making Fryer Frauncis an other Iesu in type and figure, matching him w̄ Christ frō poynt to poynt, and his miracles with Christs myracles. If the Censurer had not mencioned Frauncis the Fryer among his saints, it myght haue beene hoped the Iesuites would reformme that booke, or rather condemne it to the pit of hell. But to returne to Xilanders argument, it is a very bad one, prouing the lesser doubt by the greater. For it is not so great a doubt, what those famous Fryers taught, as whether they be in heauen. Neuertheless if it were out of doubt they are in heauen, yet the argument doeth not necessarily followe. For many are in heauen that haue liued in errour, because the rich miercie of God doth aswell pardon errour to him that repenteth, as other iniquities. No man will take this for a good argument: one of the two that were crucified with Christ is nowe in heauen, therfore he was no thiefe, therefore he liued not in error: yet such altogether is the fifth motiue that moued Xilander to go to Rome in hope perhappes to be a Saint.

Lib. Conformitat. in initio.

6 To the sixt reason which maketh the Papistes reuerent in their wordes, and the

other syde rayling, blasphemous and dishonest in their speaches and writinges, I answere with Salomons woordes: he that iustifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the innocent, are both an abhomination before the Lorde. This reason is repeated in the next, and is there further answered.

Prou. 17. 15.

7 The seuenth reason hath nothing in prayse of the Papistes as the former had: but is altogether a repetition of that which was said against the godly, as railing and misreporting their aduersaries. Wherein for proofe against this slaunder, I appeale to the places of the Censure alleaged against Martin Luther, and charging him with most foule opinions, such as after his conuersion he neuer mainteined in worde or deede, which his practise prooued while he yet liued: and his writings doe testifie now after his death. Doctor Watson also may make a triall of this matter against you, who in a sermon before Queene Marie, charged no small men as he saith, but our great bishops, to say that euery man and woman, might at the Lordes table, take bread and blesse it (which he calleth consecration) and speake the woordes of the institution, aswell as the minister. Notwithstan

D. Watson in the former of the 2. sermons printed anno. 1554.

withstanding here I am to aduertise the reader, that Papistes misrepoꝛt thē selues now saying and at an other time denying the same, as appeared in many of the xiii. articles by ꝑ Censurers own practise. Foꝛ when the Iesuites are truely charged, he will not graunt that which is truely auouched against them, but changing the question will seeme to say lesse then they teach. Foꝛ one example they are charged to commit idolatrie in woꝛshipping images: the Censurer will seeme to denie this, saying, they giue no worship to the image but to God: this distinction is not good: and furthermoꝛe the assertion is false. Foꝛ it hath been prooued that they giue woꝛship to the very image of Christ: and, which is moꝛe, that they giue ꝑ greatest woꝛship of Christ him selfe to his picture. Therefoꝛe al men are to consider this both foꝛ our defence, & to auoyde the errour that may come by their deceites. Foꝛ in the fielde, where they stand in feare of the aduersarie, and in their perswasions, when they would win a proselyte, the pretended Catholiques will not lie open, but cloke a great part of their shamefull doctrine: which is their subtiltie to drawe away disciples, and to leaue lesse aduantage to their enemies. Therefoꝛe to

a man not acquainted with their double dealing wee may seeme to report them otherwise, then they holde in disputation, when notwithstanding we report them no otherwise then they openly teache in their kingdome, and publishe in their writings. Wherefore I may conclude that this reason was grounded vpon a manifest vntruth:
Luke.22.48. Xilander iudged of Iudas by the kisse, not by the treason.

8 Lastly for a reason we are falsely charged to esteeme all our auncesters damned: to breake their willes, and conuert to prophane vses, that which they gaue to mainteine idle Monkes and Friers, and to redeeme them by masses out of purgatory. Whatsoeuer he thought in him selfe, or imagined in others, wee thinke not our an-
Iam.4.12. cesters damned: but leaue iudgement to the Lorde, to whom the iudgement of life and death doth belong: not searching out his secret counsels which are vnsearchable. As for the ornamẽts which they bestowed, not vpon the seruice of God, to the instruction of their soules, by the preaching and ministerie of the Gospell, but vpon the great harlot and to the inlargement of her kingdome, they are brought home agayne to better vses: and I thinke many of your

best

best friendes will holde and enioy them as better bestowed.

Your seconde man, commeth ready furnished to your hande out of the former booke of Lindan. But because you promise not to deliuer the same reasons that were touched before, let vs see how faithfully you keepe art and promise. Flaschius first reason is the same that Vilanders seuenth: where they say we report the papists to teach that they teach not. Also his thirde is but a particular of that which the other man did generally auouch in ẏ sixt against ẏ godly as vsing dishonest speach. Sebastian Flaschius.

To speake of them particularly, Flaschius his first reason is, that your Catholiques teach cleane contrary to that which we report of them. We report them to teach, that the Pope is supreame head of the Church, doe they teach the cleane contrary? we charge them to ascribe some merit to workes, do they teach cleane contrary? Againe we charge them that they auowe transubstantiation, do they teach no such thing? Wee moreouer chalenge them for giuing worshippe to images, do they teach the contrary doctrine? wee accuse them for denying the sufficiencie of scriptures, do they make them sufficient?

Infinite

I might bring infinite such examples, but these may be sufficiēt to shew how Flaschius stūbled at his first going out at the gate.

2 The second reason is drawen from Luthers mind in writing against ý Romish Church, of enuy, as the rūnagate doth suppose. How is this prooued out of any place quoted for a shewe of proofe? Agayne, if it were proued that enuie made M. Luther write against Popery, how doth the runnagates reason followe? The preacher preacheth of enuie, therfore his doctrine is to be forsaken: The Phisition vseth his arte for couetousnes, therfore his cosūsel is to be despised. If Flaschius had learned what the place of S. Paul ment where he saith, he was glad & reioyced that Christ was preached, eyther vpon enuie or contention, eyther for fashion sake, or in synceritie howsoeuer, it might haue bin a counterpoyson, against ý disease of this second imaginatiō.

Phil. 1. 18.

3 His third reason against M. Luther for great dishonestie & scurrilitie of speach in his writings, is another slaunder in effect all one wīth the seconde, and there answered. You say this bad fellowe was a preacher, surely thē he came in by a wrong way, & went out by a right dore, ý neuer had any sound knowledge of the trueth, or if he had

any

any, he first put back a good cõscience, & thē made shippewracke of faith & knowledge. 1. Tim. 19.1.

4 Fourthly, it is but slaũderously laid to our charge ẏ we do easily reiect any booke or peece of Scripture: for we admit as the word of God, all ẏ bookes & partes contyned in ẏ auncient & autenticall Canon of ẏ Iewes, & with our aduersaries all the new Testament, neither doe we vse or suffer the least corruption of ẏ Scripture, knowing what a curse is pronoũced against such blasphemous audacity. But you haue added the Apocrypha bookes, although they neither agree in some pointes with ẏ scripture, nor yet one with another as hath bene declared. Apoc. 22. 19.

Touching Fathers and Councils, it is too foule an accusation to charge vs, ẏ wee esteeme no more of them thē of ẏ Turkes Alcoran. Flaschius appeareth to be some corrupt hypocrite, who measured other men, by ẏ vanity & wickednes of his own heart. So farre doe wee honour the councils as they can well aske, or doe deserue honour. For (that I may bee suffered to repeate with the Censurer) we receiue from them ioyfully and with reuerence whatsoeuer they deliuer vnto vs with sufficient warrant out of the worde of God: acknowledging them not only to haue brought great

profit

profit to the church in their time, but also to their posteritie. This honour we giue not to the deuilish Alcaron: what the Apostata did or will do, I can not report.

5 The fifth reason is a slander against ye truth, blasphemously cast out against it and the professers thereof. It is that our newe opinions (as Flaschius & our enemies wil needes call them) are olde heresies, condẽned by name in the primitiue Church. Whereunto I answere, that if Saunders most traiterous booke quoted for proofe in the margent, or Lindane with his roule of heresies, or the runnagate by any good trial can proue, that either we pull olde heresies out of the graue, or breed newe that should be buried, though it be no good reason why Sebastian should flie to them, yet wee will grant it a full sufficiẽt reasõ, why he should take the wings of the morning & flie from vs. But if this runnagate in the malice and
Esa. 5. 20. error of his heart, hath spoken good of euil, and euill of good: if he haue forsaken darknes for light, and light for darknes, then he hath escaped a blessing, and made haste to finde a curse.

6, 7. The next two reasons are of ye same forge with all the rest, they prooue nothing but the malice and blindnes of your conuert.

uert. The sixt chargeth Luther with contrarietie of doctrine, the seuenth with a speache of intollerable iniquitie against faith in God. But his godly writings doe sufficiently iustifie him against these open slaunders, as was declared before against ỳ Censurers like slanderous reports. Out of his large volumes of talke at tables, wee know not so much what Luther said, or vpon what causes, as what those men remẽbred or added, which did collect the bookes.

8 The last reason of Flaschius, was cunningly chosen out to make a fit conclusion of your tasting and slaunderous Censure, hauing nothing but the venim of the aspe, that laie vnder the runnagates tongue. It standeth vpon many points shuffeled together: as that we are partiall, that we exaggerate euery litle fault in our aduersaries, and liue our selues most vitiously in fornication, and chaunge of wiues, according to Luthers doctrine: the proofe whereof is alledged in one preacher vpon the runnagates credit, with other thinges that this shamelesse man is ashamed to vtter. What an heape of reproches is this without any proofe? Against this I haue proued that M. Luther taught no libertie of fornicatiõ, but the contrarie, as appeareth at large by

many

many his learned and godly treatises. Alse the knowne doctrine and discipline of our Church free vs frõ the slaunder, who seeke a sharper punishment for such enormities, then your petie penaunce. If Flaschius euer met with a mate like him selfe, that would haue made a match w̃ him in chaunging of wives, he was to blame, except the most fault was in himselfe, that he did not bring it before the Magistrate: vpon complaint and proofes it woulde haue appeared, that ẏ religion suffereth no such wickednesse to goe vnpunished. This may be a particular slaunder like the rest, but if it were true in Flaschius and one of his companions, both fitte to haue bene thrust out of the Church before eyther departed, what is this to all?

These are your two false witnesses, wel able to discredit euen a true matter comming from their report, as they themselues are discredited by the testimonies they haue giuen in agaynst the Gospell, being reportes so full of manifest reproch and vntrueth. It is verie like they omitted the true reason of their departure. Perhappes they went out because they woulde not or coulde not any longer abide within, as it fell out with Demas

2. Tim. 4. 12.

and

and Alexander. Nowe for a recompence 1. Tim. 1. 20.
of your two runnagates, the present example not of a straunger vnknowen, but of one home borne, toucheth the quicke. Ye in your faces rendered good reasons of his conuersion from among them, where wickednesse of life, and abhomination of doctrine striue, which may cal downe the greatest vengeaunce. But this needeth not my repetition, and I labour not to presse you with examples of corruptions of men: it is beside the question we haue in hande. My prayer and labour is for the defence of his trueth, from the which we receiue life, and 1. Cor. 9. 16.
are to striue for it vnto death. The Lord requireth this seruice at our hands, & he will at his good time blesse it with manifolde blessings, the fruit whereof it may be some of vs shal not see, but our posteritie shal behold it, notwithstanding all the wisedome Pro. 21. 30.
and power and counsell of man to the contrary. For the Lord hath reuealed the man of sin by the preaching of the worde, & hath shaken his chaire with a mightie arme, hee wil not withdraw his hand, til he hath vtterly cõsumed Antichrist with the spirit of his 2. Thes. 2. 8.
mouth, & abolished him w̃ the brightnesse of his comming. In the meane time his little flocke may bee somewhat scattered for a time

time of trial, but they shal be gathered together againe & increased to shewe the Lords
Psal.106.6. power and mercie: they may sow in teares, but they shal reape with gladnesse. This is the harvest account the godly can make.
Ier.10.24. But it may be that the Lord will himselfe correct vs in mercy, and not deliuer vs into the hands of our enemies to be punished by
Iudg.5.28. them: It may be, the mother of Sisera shall looke out at the window, and cry out at the casement, why is his chariot so long a cõming? why tary the wheeles of his charet? So let thine enemies perish O Lorde, but let them that loue thee and thy trueth, con-
Psal.32.10. tinue as the Sunne when he riseth in his might, and as Oliue plants in the house of God that flourish for euer. Amen.

FINIS.

Imprinted at London by Christopher Barker, Printer *to the Queenes most* excellent Maiestie.